

COMPUTABLE CONDITIONS FOR THE OCCURRENCE OF NON-UNIFORM HYPERBOLICITY IN FAMILIES OF ONE-DIMENSIONAL MAPS

STEFANO LUZZATTO AND HIROKI TAKAHASI

ABSTRACT. We formulate and prove a Jakobson-Benedicks-Carleson type theorem on the occurrence of nonuniform hyperbolicity (stochastic dynamics) in families of one-dimensional maps, based on *computable starting conditions* and providing *explicit, computable*, lower bounds for the measure of the set of selected parameters. As a first application of our results we show that the set of parameters corresponding to maps in the quadratic family $f_a(x) = x^2 - a$ which have an absolutely continuous invariant probability measure is at least 10^{-5000} .

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider families $\{f_a\}_{a \in \Omega}$ of C^2 interval maps with a single quadratic critical point and the parameter a belonging some interval Ω . Families of interval maps can exhibit a wide variety of dynamical behaviour, ranging from the existence of attracting periodic orbits to the existence of absolutely continuous (with respect to Lebesgue) invariant measures with strong mixing properties, as well as all kinds of intermediate and pathological phenomena. These dynamical phenomena can depend very sensitively, and very discontinuously, on the parameter even in very smooth parametrized families, see [33] for a comprehensive survey. We say that $a \in \Omega$ is a *regular* parameter if f_a has an attracting periodic orbit; we say that $a \in \Omega$ is a *stochastic* parameter if f_a admits an ergodic invariant probability measure μ which is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue and has a positive Lyapunov exponent $\lambda(\mu) = \int \log |f'| d\mu$. Then we define

$$\Omega^- = \{a : a \text{ is regular} \} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega^+ = \{a : a \text{ is stochastic} \}.$$

We remark that the positivity of the Lyapunov exponent is sometimes a non-trivial but automatic consequence of the existence of an absolutely continuous invariant probability measure. This is the case for example for maps with a single critical point such as those considered here [17] and is probably true for more general maps with multiple critical points (it is of course false for maps without critical points such as rigid circle rotations). We include it here in the definition since it is a feature which plays a key role in the giving rise to stochastic behaviour, see [1, 8, 18, 22, 46] for results and references to results concerning the precise “random-like” properties of such maps.

Date: February 2, 2008.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 37D25, 37M99, 37E25.

For families of maps with a single critical point it is also known that the sets Ω^- and Ω^+ are disjoint, see [33]. Moreover, for generic families with a quadratic critical point both Ω^- and Ω^+ have positive measure and their union has full measure [3–5, 30]. These are therefore the only two “typical” phenomena. The topological structure of the two sets is however very different: Ω^- is *open and dense* in Ω [12, 19, 20, 31] and thus Ω^+ , which is contained in the complement of Ω^- , is *nowhere dense*. The fact that it has positive measure is therefore non-trivial. This was first shown in the ground-breaking work of Jakobson [16] and was generalized, over the years, in several papers; we mention in particular [6, 10, 13, 14, 33, 36, 39, 41, 45] for smooth maps with non-degenerate critical points, [40] for maps with a degenerate (flat) critical point, and [23, 24] for maps with both critical points and singularities with unbounded derivatives.

The fact that stochastic behaviour occurs for a nowhere dense set of parameters means that, notwithstanding the fact that it also occurs with positive probability, it is a difficult set to actually “pinpoint” in practice. In this paper we are concerned with the problem of estimating *explicitly* the measure of the set Ω^+ . Notwithstanding the extensive amount of research in the area, none of the existing results provide any explicit quantitative bounds on the relative measure of Ω^+ in Ω . The arguments are constructive to some extent: they “construct” a set of stochastic parameters in a given parameter interval Ω . However they all apply only under the assumptions that Ω is a *sufficiently small* neighbourhood of some *sufficiently good* parameter value a^* . Both of these assumptions are problematic in different ways which we discuss briefly in the following paragraphs.

The size of the neighbourhood Ω of a^* to which the arguments apply, as well as the proportion of Ω^+ in Ω , is not computed in any of the existing arguments. This is to some extent more of a technical issue than a conceptual one: explicit estimates can probably be obtained from the existing papers by more careful control of the interdependence of the constants involved. It should be noted nevertheless that this interdependence is quite subtle; the issue might be technical but this does not make it non-trivial.

A more delicate issue is the assumption that the parameter interval Ω contains some good parameter a^* . This gives rise to the problem of verifying the presence of such a parameter in Ω and of computing the required quantitative information related to the “goodness” of a^* . It turns out that this is essentially impossible in general. Several conditions of various kinds have been identified which imply that a given parameter value is stochastic [1, 8–10, 15, 34, 35] but, apart from some exceptional cases, all these conditions require information about an *infinite number of iterations* and thus are, to all effects and purposes, *uncheckable*. It can also be shown that in a formal theoretical sense the set Ω^+ is *undecidable*, see [2].

The main objective of this paper is to overcome these difficulties. We present a *quantitative parameter exclusion argument* which gives explicit lower bounds on the proportion of Ω^+ in some parameter intervals Ω and, perhaps most importantly, base this argument on *explicitly computable* starting conditions which can be computed in finite time and with finite precision. In Section 3 we give an application to the quadratic family and obtain a first ever explicit lower bound for measure of Ω^+ . In the remaining sections we prove the main theorem.

2. STATEMENT OF RESULTS

To simplify the calculations we shall consider one-parameter families of C^2 interval maps of the form

$$f_a(x) = f(x) - a$$

for some map $f : I \rightarrow I$ with a single quadratic critical point c and the parameter a belonging to some interval Ω . In particular the critical point $c \in I$ does not change with the parameter; this is not an essential condition but simplifies some of the already very technical estimates. For the same reason we shall suppose without loss of generality that the interval I contains strictly the interval $[-1, 1]$, that the critical point $c = 0$, and that $f_a(c) > 1$ for all parameters $a \in \Omega$. These conditions always hold up to a linear rescaling which will not affect the argument.

We remark that we are thinking of Ω as being “small” in a sense which will become clear. This is a natural and general setting: the estimates can easily be applied to a “large” parameter interval by subdividing it into smaller subintervals and considering each such subinterval independently. For future reference we let $\varepsilon = |\Omega|$.

2.1. Computable starting conditions. We start by formulating several conditions in terms of six constants

$$N, \delta, \iota, C_1, \lambda, \alpha_0, \lambda_0.$$

First of all we define critical neighbourhoods

$$\Delta := (-\delta, \delta) \subset (-\delta^\iota, \delta^\iota) =: \Delta^+.$$

We shall assume without loss of generality that both $\log \delta$ and $\iota \log \delta$ are integers.

(A1) Uniform expansivity outside a critical neighbourhood: for all $a \in \Omega, x \in I, n \geq 1$ such that $x, f_a(x), \dots, f_a^{n-1}(x) \notin \Delta$ we have:

$$|(f_a^n)'(x)| \geq \begin{cases} C_1 e^{\lambda n} & \text{if } f_a^n(x) \in \Delta^+ \\ e^{\lambda n} & \text{if } x \in f_a(\Delta^+) \text{ and/or } f_a^n(x) \in \Delta. \end{cases}$$

(A2) Random distribution of critical orbits: There exists $\tilde{N} \geq N$ such that $|f_a^n(c)| \geq \delta^\iota$ for all $n \leq \tilde{N}$ and

$$(1) \quad |\Omega_{\tilde{N}}| := |\{f_a^{\tilde{N}}(c) : a \in \Omega\}| \geq \delta^\iota.$$

(A3) Bounded recurrence of the critical orbit: for all $a \in \Omega$ and all $N \geq n \geq 1$ we have

$$|f_a^n(c)| \geq e^{-\alpha_0 n}.$$

(A4) Non-Resonance: There exists an integer $\tilde{N} \geq 1$ such that

$$1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{(f_a^i)'(c_0)} \neq 0 \quad \forall k \in [1, \tilde{N}], \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - \left| \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \frac{1}{(f_a^i)'(c_0)} \right| - \frac{e^{-\lambda_0(\tilde{N}+1)}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_0}} > 0.$$

We emphasize that all of these conditions are *computable* in the sense that they can be verified in a finite number of steps and using explicit numerical calculations relying only

on finite precision and depending only on a finite number of iterations. This does not mean however that their verification in practice is trivial or even easy; we shall discuss below some of the computational issues which arise when applying our results to specific situations.

Condition (A1) says that some uniform expansivity estimates hold outside the critical neighbourhoods, uniformly for all parameter values. This is in some sense the most important condition of all, the general principle being that *if we have uniform expansivity on a sufficiently large region of the phase space for all parameter values, then we have nonuniform expansivity on all the phase space for a large region of the parameter space*. For a single parameter value this expansivity is known to hold under extremely weak conditions [32], although in general the constants C_1 and λ will depend on δ . By continuity it then holds for nearby maps though, again, the size of an allowed perturbation in general will depend at least on δ and λ . Condition (A1) as stated therefore is not a strong assumption *per se*, but becomes strong if we want it to hold for large λ , small δ and/or a large interval of parameter values. On the other hand it is important to have a “large enough” parameter interval relative to the choice of δ, ι for otherwise (A1) could be satisfied even though all parameters in Ω have an attracting periodic orbit (this may happen, for instance, if the attracting periodic orbit always has at least one point in Δ , then its attracting nature could be invisible to derivative estimates outside Δ).

The appropriate condition on the size of Ω is given in (A2) which says that the size of the interval given by the images of the critical points for all parameter values at some time is large enough. Technically this gives a sufficiently “random” distribution of the images to provide the first step of the probabilistic induction argument, showing that critical orbits have small probability of returning close to the critical point. This is, conceptually, the core of the overall argument and this condition is essentially implicit in all arguments of this kind, in the language of Benedicks-Carleson [6, 7] and other papers which follows similar strategies, such as [23, 24]. Intervals of parameter values satisfying these conditions are called *escaping components*.

Condition (A3) has been used by Benedicks and Carleson and other people and has proved extremely useful in arguments related to shadowing the critical point. Notice however that this condition only refers to an initial finite number of iterates, as part of the inductive construction we will guarantee that it continues to hold for all good parameter values for all time, see Section 4. We do not feel however that it is as essential a condition as (A1) and (A2), but rather more of a technical simplifying assumption, albeit one that is not easy to remove in this context. Binding period arguments analogous to the ones developed here using this condition have been generalized in [8] in order to study the statistical properties of a large class of maps with several critical points.

Condition (A4) is easily checked for parameter neighbourhoods of particularly good parameter values, such as when the critical orbit is pre-periodic or non-recurrent. A similar condition played an important role in the work of Tsujii [41] in generalizing parameter exclusion arguments to neighbourhood of quite general maps. Again however we do feel that this is more of a technical simplifying assumption rather than a deep condition. In principle it should be possible to weaken or possibly even dispense with both (A3) and

(A4) although this would certainly require some non-trivial technical improvements in the argument.

2.2. Conditions on the constants. Our assumptions on the family $\{f_a\}$ will be that conditions (A1)-(A4) hold for a set of constants $N, \delta, \iota, C_1, \lambda, \alpha_0, \lambda_0$ satisfying certain non-trivial formal relationships (C1)-(C4) which we proceed to formulate. The first condition is formulated purely in terms of the constants introduced above:

$$(C1) \quad \lambda > \lambda_0 > \alpha_0 \geq \log \delta^{-1/N} \quad \text{and} \quad \log \delta^{-\iota} \geq e^{-\frac{1+\lambda_0}{2}}.$$

This gives a first constraint on the relative values of the constants. We remark that the second expression is essentially trivial since generally speaking $\log \delta^{-\iota}$ is large and λ_0 is small; however it does not appear to be a formal consequence of any of the other assumptions and we do use it below, therefore we add it here as a formal assumption. Additional constraints are imposed indirectly via the definition of a set of auxiliary constants in the order given in the following list:

$$M_1, M_2, L_1, L_2, \alpha_1, N_1, \mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_3, \gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma, \hat{D}, \hat{\hat{D}}, \mathcal{D}, \Gamma_1, k_0, \tau_1, \tau_0, C_3, \tilde{C}_3, \tau, \alpha, \tilde{\eta}, \eta.$$

As these constants are introduced we shall define conditions which implicitly impose conditions on the original constants $N, \delta, \iota, C_1, \lambda, \alpha_0, \lambda_0$. The entire procedure is aimed at obtaining a value for the last constant η , which appears in the statement of the Theorem below.

We remark first that the constants $M_1, M_2, L_1, L_2, N_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_3$ require some amount of computation concerning the geometry and/or the dynamics of the family $\{f_a\}$. In particular they are not defined exactly: they are “estimates” which are required to satisfy some lower or upper bounds. We shall use the notation $:\geq$ to denote the fact that the constant on the left is required to be an upper bound for the expression on the right. Similarly for $:\leq$. The four constants $\alpha_1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \alpha$ are chosen with some freedom within certain ranges depending on the previously chosen constants. The remaining constants are defined directly in terms of those defined previously.

We start with fixing constants M_1, M_2, L_1, L_2 so that

$$M_1 : \geq \max\{|f'_a(x)|\} \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 : \geq \max\{|f''_a(x)|\},$$

where the maximum is taken over all $(x, a) \in I \times \Omega$, and L_1 and L_2 are chosen such that

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} L_1^{-1}|x - c|^2 \geq |f_a(x) - f_a(c)| \geq L_1|x - c|^2 \\ L_1^{-1}|x - c| \geq |f'_a(x)| \geq L_1|x - c| \end{cases} \quad \forall x \in \Delta, a \in \Omega$$

and $L_2^{-1}|x - c| \geq |f'_a(x)| \geq L_2|x - c| \quad \forall x \in I, a \in \Omega$. Notice that L_1 is used in bounds in Δ whereas L_2 applies to the entire interval I . We then choose some

$$(3) \quad \lambda_0 \geq: \alpha_1 \geq: \alpha_0$$

and define the following constants. First of all let

$$(4) \quad N_1 \leq: \max\{i : d(f^i(\Delta_0), c) \geq 1\},$$

where $d(f^i(\Delta_0), c)$ denotes the distance of iterates of $\Delta_0 = f(\Delta)$ from the critical point c , minimized over all parameters in Ω . We can assume without loss of generality that $N_1 \geq 1$, recall the discussion at the beginning of Section 2.

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{D}_1 := \exp \left(\frac{M_2}{L_2} \left(\frac{e^{-\alpha_1}}{1 - e^{-\alpha_1}} + \frac{e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_0)(N_1 + 1)}}{(1 - e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_0)(N_1 + 1)})(1 - e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_0)})} \right) \right),$$

$\mathcal{D}_1$ bounds the distortion during binding periods, see Section 5 and Sublemma 5.1.1.

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{D}_2 := \max_{a \in \Omega} \max \left\{ \max_{1 \leq k \leq \tilde{N}} \left\{ \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{(f_a^i)'(c_0)} \right| \right\}, \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \frac{1}{(f_a^i)'(c_0)} \right| + \frac{e^{-\lambda_0(\tilde{N}+1)}}{(1 - e^{-\lambda_0})} \right\},$$

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{D}_3^{-1} := \min_{a \in \Omega} \min \left\{ \min_{1 \leq k \leq \tilde{N}} \left\{ \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{(f_a^i)'(c_0)} \right| \right\}, 1 - \left| \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \frac{1}{(f_a^i)'(c_0)} \right| - \frac{e^{-\lambda_0(\tilde{N}+1)}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_0}} \right\},$$

recall that $\tilde{N}$ is given (with some freedom) by condition (A4). The constants $\mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_3$ appear in the context of the estimates which compare derivatives with respect to the parameter and derivatives with respect to the space variable, see Lemma 5.2. Condition (A4) is designed specifically to ensure that $\mathcal{D}_3 > 0$. The values of $\mathcal{D}_2$ and $\mathcal{D}_3$, or the complexity of the calculation, can be optimized by choosing different values for $\tilde{N}$. Then we define

$$(8) \quad \gamma_0 := \frac{2 + \log 2 + 5 \log \log \delta^{-1}}{\log \delta^{-1}},$$

The definition of γ_0 comes from the combinatorial estimates in Section 7.4. We choose

$$(9) \quad \min \left\{ 1 - \frac{\log C_1^{-1} + 2 \log \log \delta^{-\iota}}{\log \delta^{-\iota}}, 1 - \gamma_0 \right\} >: \gamma_1 > 0.$$

The first condition here guarantees the convergence of the infinite sum in Sublemma 6.3.2. The second condition appears in the statement of the key Proposition 7.2. it also allows us to choose some

$$1 - (\gamma_0 + \gamma_1) >: \gamma_2 > 0 \quad \text{and let} \quad \gamma := \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \in (0, 1),$$

γ_2 and γ both appear in the statement of Proposition 7.1. Now we define

$$(10) \quad \hat{D} := 2 + \frac{2C_1^{-1}\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} + \frac{2\mathcal{D}_1\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3L_1^{-2}}{1 - e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_0)}},$$

$$(11) \quad \hat{\hat{D}} = \left[\left(2 + e^{\frac{(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}{(\log \delta^{-\iota} - 1)^2}} \right) \frac{(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}{(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2 - C_1^{-1}\delta^{\iota(1-\gamma_1)}} \right] \frac{1}{\log \delta^{-\iota} - 1},$$

$\hat{D}$ and $\hat{\hat{D}}$ are simply shortcuts to long expressions. We then let

$$(12) \quad \mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3 \exp \left(\frac{M_2}{L_2} \left(\hat{D}\hat{\hat{D}} + \frac{C_1^{-1}\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3e^{-\lambda}}{(1 - e^{-\lambda})} \right) \right),$$

$\mathcal{D}$ is the global distortion bound, see Lemma 6.3.

$$(13) \quad \Gamma_1 := \mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}_1\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3e^{1+\lambda_0}/L_1C_1,$$

the constant Γ_1 is a large “dummy” constant used to formulate the estimates on the derivative growth at the end of binding periods, see (24). It allows us to cancel out the small constant arising in the estimate (69). The “payback” for having such large Γ_1 will be in terms of a lower bound on γ_1 , see below.

$$(14) \quad k_0 := \max \left\{ \frac{\log(\mathcal{D}_1/L_1) + \lambda_0 + \alpha_1}{\log \delta^{-\iota}}, 0 \right\}, \quad \tau_1 := \frac{2}{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1} \leq \frac{2 + k_0}{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1} =: \tau_0,$$

k_0 is of no particular significance, it is just used in the definition of τ_0 ; its definition come from the proof of Sublemma 5.1.2, see (29). τ_0, τ_1 appear in the binding period estimates, Sublemmas 5.1.2 and 5.1.3. We can now formulate the next condition

$$(C2) \quad \tau_0\alpha_0 < 1.$$

The product $\alpha_0\tau_0$ is related to the length of the binding periods, see (23), Lemma 5.1. Then we define

$$(15) \quad C_3 := \mathcal{D}_1^{-\frac{\lambda_0+2\alpha_1}{\lambda_0+\alpha_1}} L_1^{2+\frac{\alpha_1}{\lambda_0+\alpha_1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{C}_3 := \frac{2^{\alpha_1\tau_1-1}L_1^2}{2\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}_1^2\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3}C_3,$$

C_3 and $\tilde{C}_3$ have no particular significance, they are just a shorthand way of writing some complex expressions arising in the paper. They are first used in (31) and in (35) respectively. We require

$$(C3) \quad \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \iota + \frac{\log(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3C_1^{-1}) + 2\log \log \delta^{-\iota}}{\log \delta^{-1}} \\ \alpha_1\tau_1 + \frac{\log(\Gamma_1\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3\tilde{C}_3^{-1}e^{\alpha_1\tau_1-1}) + 2\log \log \delta^{-\iota}}{\iota \log \delta^{-1}} \end{array} \right\} \leq \gamma_1.$$

These conditions arise in (73) and (41) respectively.

$$(16) \quad \tau := \frac{\tau_0}{1 - \gamma_1} \left(1 + \frac{\log |I| + 2\log \log \delta^{-1} - \log \Gamma_1}{\log \delta^{-1}} \right) > 0.$$

The constant τ gives the total proportion of iterates which belong to binding periods, see Lemma 5.3. We remark that it is not clear directly from the definition that $\tau > 0$. However this follows *a fortiori* from estimates (42) and (43) at the end of the proof of Sublemma 5.3.

$$(17) \quad \alpha := \min \left\{ \alpha_0, \frac{\lambda - \lambda_0}{\left(\tau \left(\lambda - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0} \right) + 1 \right)} \right\} > 0.$$

The requirement (17) on α comes from the growth estimates in the proof of Lemma 6.2. Notice that the fact that $\alpha > 0$ comes from $\lambda - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0} \geq \lambda - (1-\gamma_1)\left(\frac{\lambda_0+\alpha_1}{2}\right) \geq \lambda - (1-\gamma_1)\lambda_0 \geq$

$\lambda - \lambda_0 > 0$. The first inequality comes from the definition of τ_0 , the second from the fact that $\alpha_1 < \lambda_0$, the third from the fact that $\gamma_1 < 1$, the fourth from (C1).

$$\tilde{\eta} := e^{-\gamma_2 \alpha} \left(1 + \sum_{R \geq \log \delta^{-1}} e^{-(1-\gamma)R} \right) = e^{-\gamma_2 \alpha} \left(1 + \frac{\delta^{1-\gamma}}{1 - e^{-(1-\gamma)}} \right),$$

$\tilde{\eta}$ appears in Subsection 7.1. We can then formulate our final condition which includes the definition of the main constant which appears in the statement of the Main Theorem.

$$(C4) \quad \eta := \sum_{j=N}^{\infty} \tilde{\eta}^j = \frac{\tilde{\eta}^N}{1 - \tilde{\eta}} < 1.$$

2.3. The main result. We are now ready to state our main result. First we define the set

$$\Omega^* := \{a \in \Omega : |(f_a^n)'(c_0)| \geq e^{\lambda_0 n} \ \forall n \geq 0\}.$$

By classical results, for any $a \in \Omega^*$, f_a admits an ergodic absolutely continuous invariant probability measure and thus $\Omega^* \subseteq \Omega^+$.

Main Theorem. *Let $f_a : I \rightarrow I$ be a family of C^2 unimodal maps with a quadratic critical point, of the form $f_a(x) = f(x) - a$, for a belonging to some interval Ω of parameter values. Suppose that there exist constants $N, \delta, \iota, C_1, \lambda, \alpha_0, \lambda_0$ so that conditions (A1)-(A4) and (C1)-(C4) hold. Then*

$$|\Omega^*| \geq (1 - \eta)|\Omega|.$$

In Section 3 we give an application to the quadratic family and in Sections 4 to 7 we give a complete proof. First of all we make some general remarks;

2.3.1. Computer-assisted proofs. The spirit of this result is to have a ready-made “formula” for proving rigorously the existence, and for obtaining a lower bound for the probability, of stochastic dynamics in a given family of maps. In some sense we think of this result as a *computer-assisted* theorem in (non-uniformly) hyperbolic dynamics. The combination of rigorous numerical/computational methods with deep geometric/analytic/probabilistic methods can be extremely powerful with each approach contributing to overcome the limitations of the other. Indeed there exist extremely powerful techniques in Dynamical Systems and Ergodic Theory which yield highly sophisticated results about the fine structure and long term behaviour of certain systems, but these methods often rely on certain geometric assumptions, usually hyperbolicity assumptions, which are highly non trivial to verify in practice. On the other hand numerical/computational methods are much more flexible and in principle can be applied to essentially any system but suffer from the fundamental limitation of having finite precision and being able to deal with only finite time properties. These two approaches are therefore naturally complementary and the research presented in this paper is precisely a step in the direction of implementing this point of view.

There are of course several other results in Dynamics, some of which have proved groundbreaking, which have benefited from such a combination of methods, although, as far as we

know, not in the area of non-uniform hyperbolicity. We mention here just some of these: the pioneering work, also in the context of families of interval maps, of Collet, Eckmann and Lanford on the hyperbolicity of the renormalization operator, [11, 21]; the development of computational implementations of ideas from Conley Index theory, see [26, 27] and in particular the book [25] for a comprehensive review and references. The history of the study of the Lorenz attractor [29] is particularly interesting from this point of view: over more than 20 years sophisticated geometrical/analytical methods have been applied to a “geometric model” of the attractor, essentially assuming some hyperbolicity conditions of the equations. Recently these conditions have been verified by Tucker [42, 43] using a combination of numerical and analytic methods and thus the abstract results developed for the geometric model immediately apply to the actual Lorenz equations.

Finally, we mention also the extremely interesting area of so-called *constructive KAM theory* which aims to give a more concrete and quantitative understanding of the classical abstract results of KAM theory (see [28] for a comprehensive survey and references). Although KAM theory deals in many ways with situations which are the complete opposite of the theory of hyperbolicity, there are some striking structural similarities such as the occurrence of certain dynamical phenomena for nowhere dense sets of positive Lebesgue measure. Analogously to the situation in KAM theory, the first twenty years of work in non-uniform hyperbolicity has been relatively abstract and the present work can perhaps be seen as an initial step in the direction of an analogous *constructive theory of non-uniform hyperbolicity* providing a concrete and quantitative understanding of the abstract results.

2.3.2. Computational issues. Though we have stressed the computability of our assumptions, and indeed give a concrete application of our result, we emphasize that a systematic and extensive application of our results involves several non-trivial theoretical and computational issues.

The first, relatively obvious, issue is the development of rigorous computational algorithms to verify conditions (A1)-(A4). Of these conditions, (A1) is probably the most technically and computationally demanding requiring some non-trivial algorithm. However, even for condition (A1) and also for the other three conditions, the problem essentially boils down to having sufficient precision in the calculations and thus does not seem to present particular conceptual hurdles. Rather, it is likely that issues regarding the ‘computational cost’ and ‘efficiency’ of the algorithms will come into play, since in general the number of iterations which need to be computed will be quite large.

A second, less obvious but probably ultimately more difficult, issue is that of finding a systematic way of adjusting the constants $N, \delta, \iota, C_1, \lambda, \alpha_0, \lambda_0$ as well as the length of the subinterval Ω of parameters and the auxiliary constants, so that all the conditions are satisfied. A natural situation would be that conditions (A1)-(A4) have been verified for a certain set of constants $N, \delta, \iota, C_1, \lambda, \alpha_0, \lambda_0$ but that these constants fail one of the conditions (C1)-(C4). One then has many options such as changing any one or more of the constants and trying to verify (A1)-(A4) and (C1)-(C4) again. The interdependence of the various conditions is however quite subtle, non-monotone, and trial and error does not appear to be a satisfactory strategy in general. It would therefore be essential to find

a systematic way of optimizing the choices in order to converge to a set of constants in which all conditions are satisfied.

2.3.3. Notation. We introduce some notation which will be used extensively below. We let $c_0 = c_0(a) = f_a(0)$ denote the *critical value* of f_a and for $i \geq 0$, $c_i = c_i(a) = f^i(c_0)$. A key feature of the argument involves considering a family of maps from parameter space to dynamical space which tracks the orbits of the critical points for different parameter values: for $n \geq 0$ and $\omega \subseteq \Omega$ let

$$\omega_n = \{c_n(a); a \in \omega\} \subseteq I.$$

2.4. Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Hiroshi Kokubu and Konstantin Mischaikow for the fundamental role they have played in the the origin and development of this project. The idea of a computational approach to the parameter exclusion argument has been around probably as long as the argument itself; Benedicks and Jakobson at least have been conscious of such a potential and certainly other people would have thought about it. As far as we are concerned however, the stimulus for this project came from Mischaikow's suggestion and his enthusiasm and conviction regarding its feasibility. Mischaikow and Kokubu went on to organize reading groups on the topic in Atlanta and Kyoto which provided important practical motivation. In particular, HT would like to express special gratitude to his supervisor, Hiroshi Kokubu, for his encouragement and support.

We also thank Artur Avila and Marcelo Viana for pointing out an error in an earlier version of the paper, Katie Bloor, Simon Cedervall, Karla Diaz-Ordaz, Oliver Butterley for their valuable help and comments during the final proof-reading of the paper, and an anonymous referee for their support, encouragement, and general enthusiasm for the project.

3. EXPLICIT ESTIMATES FOR THE QUADRATIC FAMILY

A special, but already very interesting, example of a family of interval maps such as those considered above, is the well known quadratic family

$$f_a(x) = x^2 - a.$$

A relatively straightforward application of our Main Theorem gives us the following

Theorem 1. *Let $f_a(x) = x^2 - a$ be the quadratic family for $a \in \Omega := [2 - 10^{-4990}, 2]$. Then*

$$|\Omega^+| \geq 0.97|\Omega| > 10^{-5000}.$$

The proof actually yields a lower bound for the set

$$\Omega^* = \{a \in \Omega : |(f_a^n)'(c_0)| \geq e^{0.61n} \ \forall n \geq 0\} \subseteq \Omega^+.$$

By classical results all these maps are stochastic. We emphasize that even though the interval of parameter values under consideration here is relatively small, this is the first known rigorous explicit lower bound for the set Ω^+ in any context. The only other related work we are aware of is by Simó and Tatjer [37, 38], who carried out careful numerical estimates of the length of some of the *periodic windows*, i.e. the open connected components

of $\hat{\Omega}^-$ in $\hat{\Omega} = [\hat{a}, 2]$, where $\hat{a}$ is the Feigenbaum parameter at the limit of the first period-doubling cascade. They are able to compute the length of some relatively “large” windows (up to those of length of the order of 10^{-30} or so, though not all the windows of up to this size) and their calculations suggest a lower bound for the overall proportion of $\hat{\Omega}^-$ in $\hat{\Omega}$ of about 10%. One expects the contribution of the smaller windows to be negligible but this is probably a hard statement to prove.

A combination of the numerical methods of Simó and Tatjer with the application of the estimates given here might form a good strategy for obtaining some global bounds for the relative measures of $\hat{\Omega}^-$ and $\hat{\Omega}^+$ in the entire parameter interval $\hat{\Omega}$. Indeed, our methods appear naturally suited to the analysis of small parameter intervals and thus, in some sense, take over precisely where the purely numerical estimates no longer work. Another possible strategy might involve taking advantage of the hyperbolicity of the renormalization operator in combination, although even if such an argument were feasible, this strategy would probably give less concrete information about the actual location of parameters of $\hat{\Omega}^-$ and $\hat{\Omega}^+$.

We prove Theorem 1 in the next three sections. In Section 3.2 we discuss the choice of the main constants and check conditions (A1) to (A4); in Section 3.3 we discuss the choice of the auxiliary constants and check conditions (C1) to (C4); in Section 3.4 we enclose a copy of the Maple worksheet used to carry out the explicit numerical calculations. Once the calculations are set up it is very easy to obtain the estimates for other intervals of parameter intervals. In particular, choosing smaller intervals generally yields smaller values for η and thus a larger proportion of stochastic parameters.

3.1. Two preliminary lemmas. In this section we prove two preliminary lemmas which motivate our choice of the constants in the following subsection.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $1 \geq \delta, \iota > 0$ and $2 \geq a^* > 1$. Then, for any $a \in [a^*, 2]$ the expansivity condition (A1) holds with constants*

$$C_1 = \sqrt{\frac{4 - \delta^{2\iota}}{4 - \delta^2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = \log \left(2\delta \sqrt{\frac{4 - \delta^2}{4 - (\delta^2 - a^*)^2}} \right).$$

Proof. Let $h : (0, 1) \rightarrow (-2, 2)$ be given by $x = h(\theta) = 2 \cos \pi \theta$. For each $a \in [1, 2]$ let $\zeta_a = \pi^{-1} \cos^{-1}(\sqrt{(2+a)/4})$, and consider the family of intervals $J_a = (\zeta_a, 1 - \zeta_a) \subset [0, 1]$ and their images $I_a = h(J_a) = (-\sqrt{2+a}, \sqrt{2+a})$. For $a = 2$ we have $f_2(I_2) = I_2$, and for $a \in [0, 2)$ we have $f_a(I_a) \subset I_a$, since $f_a(0) = -a > -\sqrt{2+a}$. Thus we shall always consider $f_a : I_a \rightarrow I_a$ to be the restriction of f_a to I_a , and implicitly consider h restricted to J_a . We then define a family of maps $g_a : J_a \rightarrow J_a$ by

$$(18) \quad g_a(\theta) = h^{-1} \circ f_a \circ h(\theta) = \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left(2 \cos^2 \pi \theta - \frac{a}{2} \right).$$

Thus $h : J_a \rightarrow I_a$ defines a smooth conjugacy between f_a and g_a and, for any $n \geq 1$, we have $f_a^n = h \circ g_a^n \circ h^{-1}$. Therefore, for $x = h(\theta)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 D_x f_a^n(x) &= Dh(g_a^n(h^{-1}(x))) \cdot Dg_a^n(h^{-1}(x)) \cdot Dh^{-1}(x) \\
 &= \frac{Dh(g_a^n(\theta))}{-Dh(\theta)} Dg_a^n(\theta). \\
 (19) \quad &= \frac{\sin \pi(g_a^n(\theta))}{\sin \pi(\theta)} Dg_a^n(\theta) \quad \text{since } D_\theta h(\theta) = -2\pi \sin \pi\theta.
 \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating (18) and using the fact that $\theta = \pi^{-1} \cos^{-1}(x/2)$, as well as the standard identity $\sin(\cos^{-1}(x)) = \sqrt{1-x^2}$, to get, for $a^* \in (1, 2]$, $a \in [a^*, 2]$ and $x \notin \Delta$,

$$|D_\theta g_a(\theta)| = \left| \frac{4 \cos \pi\theta \sin \pi\theta}{\sqrt{1 - (2 \cos^2 \pi\theta - \frac{a}{2})^2}} \right| = \left| 2x \sqrt{\frac{4 - x^2}{4 - (x^2 - a)^2}} \right| \geq 2\delta \sqrt{\frac{4 - \delta^2}{4 - (\delta^2 - a^*)^2}} = \lambda.$$

The last inequality uses the fact that $|D_\theta g_a(\theta)|$ is monotone increasing in $|x|$ and a . Moreover we have

$$\frac{\sin \pi(g_a^n(\theta))}{\sin \pi(\theta)} = \frac{\sin \pi(h^{-1}(f^n(x)))}{\sin \pi(h^{-1}(x))} = \frac{\sin(\cos^{-1}(f^n(x)/2))}{\sin(\cos^{-1}(x/2))} = \sqrt{\frac{4 - (f^n(x))^2}{4 - (x)^2}}.$$

If $|x| \geq \delta$ and $|f^n(x)| \leq \delta'$, substituting into (19), we get the first part of (A1). Similarly if $|f_a^n(x)| \leq |x|$, e.g. if $x \in f_a(\Delta^+)$, and/or $f_a^n(x) \in \Delta$ we have the second part of (A1). $\square$

Notice that for $a = 2$ we have $|D_\theta g_2(\theta)| \equiv 2$ for all $\theta \neq 1/2$ or $x \neq 0$ and thus in particular $|D_x f_2^n(x)| \geq 2^n$ whenever $|f_2^n(x)| \leq |x|$, which is in itself a quite remarkable and non-trivial estimate for f_2 . It can also be checked directly from (18) that g_a is the standard “top” tent map, thus h defines a smooth conjugacy between the “top” quadratic map and the “top” tent map. Indeed this was the main idea used by Ulam and Von Neumann in their paper [44] to prove that f_2 admits an ergodic absolutely continuously invariant probability measure. Similar calculations to the ones carried out above have been used in several papers to prove similar estimates concerning the expansion outside critical neighbourhoods for maps close to f_2 . For $a < 2$, g_a is no longer piecewise linear and has a critical point at $\theta = 1/2$ (corresponding to $x = h^{-1}(\theta) = 0$). However, it has the advantage over the maps in the quadratic family that its fold near $\theta = 1/2$ is extremely “sharp” and, outside a small neighbourhood of $1/2$ the slope remain essentially close to $\log 2$, and even tends to infinity close to the boundaries of the intervals of definition J_a .

Notice also that the Lemma, as stated, does not specify any relations between δ and a^* . Indeed, for a fixed $a^* < 2$, sufficiently small values of δ give negative values of λ . This corresponds to the fact that such a parameter may have an attracting periodic orbit (recall that an open and dense set of parameters have attracting periodic orbits). If at least one point of this orbit lies inside Δ then the attracting nature of the orbit is invisible to derivative estimates outside Δ , in other words the existence of such an orbit is not incompatible to expansion estimates as in condition (A1) with $\lambda > 0$. However, if δ is so

small that all points of the attracting orbit lie outside Δ then clearly (A1) can only be satisfied from some $\lambda < 0$.

Lemma 3.2. *For all $a \in \Omega$ we have*

$$f_a^n(c_0) > 1.5 > \delta^\iota \quad \text{for all} \quad 1 \leq n \leq N := \frac{1}{\log 4} \log \frac{1}{(2 - (a^*)^2 + a^*)}.$$

Proof. For each parameter value a , f_a has two fixed points, one of which is given by $p_a = (1 + \sqrt{1 + 4a})/2$. For a close to 2 the second image of the critical point lies close to this fixed point. Indeed $c_0(a^*) = f_{a^*}(c) = -a^*$ and $c_1(a) = f_a(c_0(a)) = (c_0(a))^2 - a = a^2 - a$. For $a = 2$ we have $c_1(2) = 2 = p_2$ and the critical point actually lands on the fixed point, for $a < 2$ and close to 2 we have $a^2 - a < (1 + \sqrt{1 + 4a})/2 < 2$ and thus $c_1(a)$ lies to the left of the fixed point p_a , which itself lies to the left of the fixed point $p_2 = 2$ for f_2 .

Let $I_1 = [c_1(a), p_a]$ and $I_n = f_a^{n-1}(I_1) = [c_n(a), p_a]$. Then a simple application of the Mean Value Theorem, using the fact that the derivative is bounded above by 4, gives

$$|I_n| \leq 4^{n-1}|I_1| \leq 4^{n-1}(2 - a^2 + a)$$

for every $n \geq 1$. We have used here the fact that the length of I_1 is the distance between $c_1(a)$ and p_a which is less than the distance between $c_1(a)$ and 2, which is precisely given by $2 - c_1(a) = 2 - (a^2 - 2)$. Since p_a is very close to 2 for $a \in \Omega$ it is sufficient to show that

$$(20) \quad 4^{n-1}(2 - a^2 + a) \leq 1/4.$$

In particular that f^{n-1} is a bijection from I_1 to I_n as long as (20) holds, and thus this implies in particular $c_n(a) \geq 1/2$ as required. Taking logs and solving for n gives exactly the choice of N above. □

3.2. Condition (A1) to (A4). In this section we discuss the choice of constants in our specific setting and show that all the necessary conditions are satisfied. As per the statement of the Theorem, we have first of all

$$a^* = 2 - 10^{-4990}.$$

We remark that the exponent 4990 is chosen in order to have a round figure for the lower bound for the measure of stochastic parameters after the exclusions have been carried out. We now fix the values of δ, ι as

$$\delta = 10^{-1000} \quad \text{and} \quad \iota = 0.8$$

For these choices we have the following

Proposition 3.1. *Conditions (A1) to (A4) are satisfied for constants*

$$C_1 := \sqrt{\frac{4 - \delta^{2\iota}}{4 - \delta^2}} \simeq 1, \quad \lambda := \log \left(2\delta \sqrt{\frac{4 - \delta^2}{4 - (\delta^2 - a^*)^2}} \right) \simeq 0.693,$$

$$N := \left\lceil \frac{1}{\log 4(2 - (a^*)^2 + a^*)} \right\rceil = 8287,$$

$$\alpha_0 := \frac{\log \delta^{-1}}{N} \simeq 0.277, \quad \lambda_0 := 0.2\alpha_0 + 0.8\lambda \simeq 0.610.$$

Proposition 3.1 says in particular that all constants can be chosen as formal functions of the three variable a^*, δ, ι . We shall show below that the same is true also for the other auxiliary functions. In the statement we have given the approximate values of the constants for our particular choices of a^*, δ and ι .

Proof. Condition (A1) follows immediately from Lemma 3.1. For (A2) let $\tilde{N}$ be the smallest integer for which

$$|\Omega_{\tilde{N}}| = |f_{a^*}^{\tilde{N}}(c_0) - 2| \geq 1/4 > \delta^\iota.$$

For (A3) we just observe that Lemma 3.2 and the choice of $\alpha_0 = \log \delta^{-1}/N$ imply

$$|f_a^n(c_0)| > 1 > \delta = e^{\log \delta} \geq e^{-\frac{n}{N} \log \delta^{-1}} = e^{-\alpha_0 n} \quad \text{for } n \leq N.$$

It remains only to verify (A4), for which it suffices to choose $N_1 = 1$. Indeed, then we have $e^{-2\lambda_0}/(1 - e^{-\lambda_0}) \approx 0.65$ and so (A4) is easily seen to hold. $\square$

3.3. Conditions (C1) to (C4). We proceed to compute the auxiliary constants and prove

Proposition 3.2. *Conditions (C1) to (C4) are satisfied.*

We emphasize that all the computations are carried out in Maple on a *purely symbolic* level and thus there is no risk of approximation errors being amplified over several calculations due to floating point arithmetic etc. Maple essentially calculates the final constant η as a formal function of the previously defined constants. Only at the final stage, the command `evalf` asks for this expression to be evaluated numerically. This command can also be used at the intermediate stages to obtain approximate values arising from the intermediate calculations, and these have been shown above and will be shown below but these approximations are not used in the calculation of η .

Condition (C1) follows immediately from the calculations given above:

$$(C1) \quad \lambda \simeq 0.693 > \lambda_0 \simeq 0.610 > \alpha_0 = \log \delta^{-1/N} \simeq 0.277 \text{ and } \log \delta^{-1} - e^{-\frac{1+\lambda_0}{2}} \simeq 2302.$$

To verify the other conditions we need to compute some the other constants. First of all we have

$$M_1 = M_2 = 4 \quad \text{and} \quad L_1 = L_2 = 0.5.$$

Then we choose

$$\alpha_1 = 0.2\lambda_0 + 0.8\alpha_0 \simeq 0.344$$

We then set

$$N_1 := \left\lceil \frac{1}{\log 4} \log \frac{1}{2\delta^2} \right\rceil = 3321 < N = 8287.$$

To see that this satisfies (4) recall that from Lemma 3.2 we have $|f_a^i(c_0)| \geq 1.5$ for all $a \in \Omega$ and all $1 \leq i \leq N$. For these iterates, by the Mean Value Theorem we have

$$|f^n(\Delta_0)| \leq 4^n |\Delta_0| = 4^n \delta^2.$$

Thus it is sufficient to solve $4^n \delta^2 < 1/2$ in terms of n and this gives exactly the condition on N_1 above. We can then compute

$$\mathcal{D}_1 := \exp \left(\frac{1}{1 - e^{-\alpha_1}} + \frac{e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_0)(N_1 + 1)}}{(1 - e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_0)(N_1 + 1)})^2} \right) \simeq 31.$$

Notice that the formal expression for $\mathcal{D}_1$ contains a term M_2/L_2 in the exponent. However it is immediate from the proof of Sublemma 5.1.1 that the two terms cancel out in the case of the quadratic family. The same is also true for the overall distortion constant $\mathcal{D}$ computed below. To compute $\mathcal{D}_2$ and $\mathcal{D}_3$, we choose $\tilde{N} = N$ and use the fact that $(f_a^i)'(c_0) \geq 3^i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$. This gives

$$\mathcal{D}_2 := \frac{3}{2} + \frac{e^{-\lambda_0(N+1)}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_0}} \geq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{3^i} + \frac{e^{-\lambda_0(N+1)}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_0}} \geq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{(f_{a^*}^i)'(c_0(a^*))} + \frac{e^{-\lambda_0(N+1)}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_0}}.$$

and similarly

$$\mathcal{D}_3^{-1} := \frac{1}{2} - \frac{e^{-\lambda_0(N+1)}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_0}} \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{3^i} - \frac{e^{-\lambda_0(N+1)}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_0}} \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{(f_{a^*}^i)'(c_0(a^*))} - \frac{e^{-\lambda_0(N+1)}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_0}}.$$

This gives values of

$$\mathcal{D}_2 \simeq 1.5 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_3 \simeq 2.$$

By explicit computation we then get

$$\gamma_0 \simeq 0.017,$$

and choose

$$\gamma_1 = 0.835 \min \left\{ 1 - \frac{\log C_1^{-1} + 2 \log \log \delta^{-\iota}}{\log \delta^{-\iota}}, 1 - \gamma_0 \right\} \simeq 0.982,$$

$$\gamma_2 = 0.8(1 - \gamma_0 - \gamma_1) \simeq 0.117,$$

and so

$$\gamma := \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \simeq 0.970.$$

Then we get

$$\hat{D} \simeq 11570, \hat{\hat{D}} \simeq 0.002, \mathcal{D} \simeq 10^{14}, \Gamma_1 \simeq 10^{17}, k_0 \simeq 0.003, \tau_0 \simeq 2.098, \tau_1 \simeq 2.095.$$

We can therefore verify

$$(C2) \quad \tau_0 \alpha_0 \simeq 0.58 < 1.$$

By more explicit computations we get

$$C_3 \simeq 0.002 \quad \tilde{C}_3 \simeq 10^{-22},$$

and we can verify (C3):

$$\gamma_1 \simeq 0.835 > 0.821 \simeq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \iota + \frac{\log(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3C_1^{-1}) + 2\log\log\delta^{-\iota}}{\log\delta^{-1}} \\ \alpha_1\tau_1 + \frac{\log(\Gamma_1\mathcal{D}_2\mathcal{D}_3\tilde{C}_3^{-1}e^{\alpha_1\tau_1-1}) + 2\log\log\delta^{-\iota}}{\iota\log\delta^{-1}} \end{array} \right\}.$$

We then compute

$$\tau \simeq 12, \quad \alpha \simeq 0.009, \quad \tilde{\eta} \simeq 0.998,$$

and verify

$$(C4) \quad \eta = \frac{\tilde{\eta}^N}{1 - \eta} \simeq 0.082 < 1.$$

This gives the value of η which appears in the statement of Theorem 1.

3.4. Maple computations. We enclose a copy of the Maple worksheet used to carry out the explicit calculations. The notation should be self-explanatory.

```
> restart;
> delta:=10^(-1000): iota:=.8:epsilon:=10^(-4990):astar:= 2-epsilon:
> C1:=sqrt((4-delta^(2*iota))/(4-delta^2)):evalf[15](C1);
1.0
> lambda:=ln(2*delta*sqrt((4-delta^2)/
> (4-(delta^2-astar)^2))):evalf[15](lambda);
0.693147180559945
> N:=floor((ln(1/(2-(astar^2-astar))))/ln(4)):evalf[15](N);
8287.0
> alpha0:=-ln(delta)/N:evalf[15](alpha0);
0.277855085434300
> lambda0:=(alpha0*.2+ lambda*.8):evalf[15](lambda0);
0.610088761524283
> evalf[15](log(delta^(-1/N)));
0.277855085434300
> NR:=(exp(-2*lambda0))/(1-exp(-lambda0)):evalf[15](NR);
0.646331222657726
> C1b:=ln(delta^(-1))-exp(-(1+lambda0)/2):evalf[15](C1b);
2302.13802490916
> M1:=4:M2:=2:L1:=.5:L2:=.5:J:=4:
> alpha1:=(lambda0*.2+alpha0*.8):evalf[15](alpha1);
0.344301820623978
> N1:=floor(min(log((1-delta^iota)/delta^2)
> /log(4), N-1 )):evalf[15](N1);
```



```

3321.0
> D1:=exp(((1-exp(-alpha1))^( -1) +
> (exp(-(N1+1)*(alpha1-alpha0))/
> (1-exp(-(N1+1)*(alpha1-alpha0))))*
> ( 1-exp(-(alpha1-alpha0))))):evalf[15](D1);
30.9713855467660
> D2:=1.5 + ((exp(-lambda0*(N+1)))
> /(1-exp(-lambda0))):evalf[15](D2);
1.5
> D3minus:=0.5-((exp(-lambda0*(N+1)))/(1-exp(-lambda0))):
> D3:=D3minus^(-1):evalf[15](D3);
2.0
> gamma0:=(1+ln(2) + 5*ln(-ln(delta)) )/
> (-ln(delta)):evalf[15](gamma0);
0.0175464029210645
> gamma1max:=min(1-gamma0,
> 1-( (ln((C1^(-1))+2*ln(ln(delta^(-iota))))
> /ln(delta^(-iota))):
> evalf[15](gamma1max);
0.982453597078936
> gamma1:=0.85*gamma1max:evalf[15](gamma1);
0.835085557517095
> gamma2:=.8*(1-(gamma0+gamma1)):evalf[15](gamma2);
0.117894431649472
> gammatil:=gamma0+gamma1+gamma2:evalf[15](gammatil);
0.970526392087632
> Dhat:=2+((2*C1^(-1)*D2*D3*exp(-lambda)) /
> (1-exp(-lambda)))+ ((2*D1*D2*D3*(L1^(-2)))/
> (1-exp(-(alpha1-alpha0))) ):
> evalf[15](Dhat);
11570.3753180732
> logdiota:=log(delta^(-iota)):logdiota2:=logdiota^2:
> Dhathat:=( (2+exp(1)*(logdiota2/(logdiota-1)^2) ) *
> (logdiota2/(logdiota2-C1^(-1)*delta^(iota*(1-gamma1))))
> *(logdiota-1)^(-1) ):
> evalf[15](Dhathat);
0.00256440032673570
> Dist:=D2*D3*exp((Dhat*Dhathat+
> ((C1^(-1)*D2*D3*exp(-lambda))/( 1-exp(-lambda))))) :
> evalf[15](Dist);
463434666796857.0
> Gamma1:=Dist*D1*D2*D3*exp(1+lambda0)/(L1*C1):
> evalf[15](Gamma1);

```

```

430876756737302000.0
> k0:=max((ln(D1/L1)+lambda0+alpha1)
> /ln(delta^(-iota)),0):evalf[15](k0);
0.00275809649265672
> tau1:=2/(lambda0+alpha1):evalf[15](tau1);
2.09557809691856
> tau0:=(2+k0)/(lambda0+alpha1):evalf[15](tau0);
2.09846800021815
> evalf[15](1-tau0*alpha0);
0.416929994518240
> C3:=D1^(-(lambda0+2*alpha1)/
> (lambda0+alpha1))* L1^(2+(alpha1/(lambda0+alpha1))):
> evalf[15](C3);
0.00182183306992661
> C3til:=2^(alpha1*tau1-1)*L1^(2)*C3/
> (2*(D1^2)*Dist*D2*D3):evalf[15](C3til);
1.40784264658478 × 10-22
> evalf[10](alpha1*tau1);
0.7215113540
> gamma1min:=max(iota+(((ln(Dist*D2*D3/C1) +
> 2*ln(ln(delta^(-iota) )))/(ln(delta^(-1))))),
> alpha1*tau1+((
> ln(Gamma1*D2*D3*C3til^(-1)*exp(alpha1*tau1-1))+
> 2*ln(ln(delta^(-iota)))))/
> (iota*ln((delta)^(-1)))):evalf[15](gamma1min);
0.821673721125574
> evalf[15](gamma1-gamma1min);
0.0134118363915209
> tau:=(tau0/(1-gamma1))*
> (1+((ln(J)-ln(Gamma1))/ln(delta^(-1))) +
> (2*ln(ln(delta^(-iota)))/ln(delta^(-1)))):
> evalf[15](tau);
12.5909564129903
> alpha:=min(alpha0,(lambda-lambda0)/(tau*
> (lambda-((1-gamma1)/tau0))+1)):evalf[15](alpha);
0.00950554901234048
> etatil:=exp(-gamma2*alpha)*(1+((delta^(1-gammatil))/
> (1-exp(-1+gammatil)))):evalf[15](etatil);
0.998879976396842
> eta:=(etatil^(N))/(1-etatil):evalf[15](eta);
0.0827085919317526

```

4. SETTING UP THE INDUCTION

The remaining sections of the paper are devoted to proving the main Theorem. In this Section 4 we give the formal inductive construction of the set Ω^* . In Section 5 we prove the main technical lemma concerning the shadowing of the critical orbit. In Section 6 we prove the inductive step in the definition of Ω^* and in Section 7 we obtain the lower bound on $|\Omega^*|$.

4.1. Inductive assumptions. Let $\Omega^{(0)} = \Omega$ and $\mathcal{P}^{(0)} = \{\Omega^{(0)}\}$ denote the trivial partition of Ω . Given $n \geq 1$ suppose that for each $k \leq n - 1$ there exists a set $\Omega^{(k)} \subseteq \Omega$ satisfying the combinatorial structure described in the next paragraph and satisfying the following four bulleted properties.

There exists a partition $\mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ of $\Omega^{(k)}$ into intervals such that each $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ has an associated *itinerary* constituted by the following information (for the moment we describe the combinatorial structure as abstract data, the geometrical meaning of this data will become clear in the next section). To each $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ is associated a sequence $0 = \theta_0 < \theta_1 < \dots < \theta_r \leq k$, $r = r(\omega) \geq 0$ of *escape times*. Escape times are divided into three categories, i.e. *substantial*, *essential*, and *inessential*. Inessential escapes possess no combinatorial feature and are only relevant to the analytic bounded distortion argument to be developed later. Substantial and essential escapes play a role in splitting itineraries into segments in the following sense. Let $0 = \eta_0 < \eta_1 < \dots < \eta_s \leq k$, $s = s(\omega) \geq 0$ be the maximal sequence of substantial and essential escape times. Between any of the two η_{i-1} and η_i (and between η_s and k) there is a sequence $\eta_{i-1} < \nu_1 < \dots < \nu_t < \eta_i$, $t = t(\omega, i) \geq 0$ of *essential return times* (or *essential returns*) and between any two essential returns ν_{j-1} and ν_j (and between ν_t and η_i) there is a sequence $\nu_{j-1} < \mu_1 < \dots < \mu_u < \nu_j$, $u = u(\omega, i, j) \geq 0$ of *inessential return times* (or *inessential returns*). Following essential and inessential return (resp. escape) there is a time interval $[\nu_j + 1, \nu_j + p_j]$ (resp. $[\mu_j + 1, \mu_j + p_j]$) with $p_j > 0$ called the *binding period*. A binding period cannot contain any return and escape times. Finally, associated to each essential and inessential return time (resp. escape) is a positive integer r called the *return depth* (resp. *escape depth*).

• **Bounded Recurrence.** We define the function $\mathcal{E}^{(k)} : \Omega^{(k)} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ which associates to each $a \in \Omega^{(k)}$ the total sum of all essential return depths of the element $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ containing a in its itinerary up to and including time k . Notice that $\mathcal{E}^{(k)}$ is constant on elements of $\mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ by construction. Then, for all $a \in \Omega^{(k)}$

$$(BR)_k \quad \mathcal{E}^{(k)}(a) \leq \alpha k.$$

• **Slow Recurrence.** For all $a \in \Omega^{(k)}$ and all $i \leq k$ we have

$$(SR)_k \quad |c_i(a)| \geq e^{-\alpha_0 i}.$$

• **Hyperbolicity.** For all $a \in \Omega^{(k)}$

$$(EG)_k \quad |(f_a^{k+1})'(c_0)| \geq e^{\lambda_0(k+1)}.$$

• **Bounded Distortion.** Critical orbits with the same combinatorics satisfy uniformly comparable derivative estimates: For every $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$, every pair of parameter values $a, b \in \omega$ and every $j \leq \nu + p + 1$ where ν is the last return or escape before or equal to time k and p is the associated binding period, we have

$$(BD)_k \quad \frac{|(f_a^j)'(c_0)|}{|(f_b^j)'(c_0)|} \leq \mathcal{D} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|c_j'(a)|}{|c_j'(b)|} \leq \mathcal{D}.$$

Moreover if k is a substantial escape a similar distortion estimate holds for all $j \leq l$ (l is the next chopping time) replacing $\mathcal{D}$ by $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and ω by any subinterval $\omega' \subseteq \omega$ which satisfies $\omega'_l \subseteq \Delta^+$. In particular for $j \leq k$, the map $c_j : \omega \rightarrow \omega_j = \{c_j(a) : a \in \omega\}$ is a bijection.

4.2. **Definition of $\Omega^{(n)}$ and $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}$.** For $r \in \mathbb{N}$, let $I_r = [e^{-r}, e^{-r+1})$, $I_{-r} = -I_r$. Then

$$\Delta^+ = \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{|r| \geq r_{\delta+} + 1} I_r \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta = \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{|r| \geq r_{\delta+} + 1} I_r.$$

where $r_{\delta} = \log \delta^{-1}$, $r_{\delta+} = \iota \log \delta^{-1}$. Recall that we can suppose without loss of generality that $r_{\delta}, r_{\delta+} \in \mathbb{N}$. Subdivide each I_r into r^2 subintervals of equal length. This defines partitions $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}^+$ of Δ^+ with $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^+|_{\Delta}$. An interval belonging to either one of these partitions is of the form $I_{r,m}$ with $m \in [1, r^2]$. Let $I_{r,m}^{\ell}$ and $I_{r,m}^{\rho}$ denote the elements of $\mathcal{I}^+$ adjacent to $I_{r,m}$ and let $\hat{I}_{r,m} = I_{r,m}^{\ell} \cup I_{r,m} \cup I_{r,m}^{\rho}$. If $I_{r,m}$ happens to be one of the extreme subintervals of $\mathcal{I}^+$ then let $I_{r,m}^{\ell}$ or $I_{r,m}^{\rho}$, depending on whether $I_{r,m}$ is a left or right extreme, denote the intervals $\left(-\delta^{\iota} - \frac{\delta^{\iota}}{(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}, -\delta^{\iota}\right]$ or $\left[\delta^{\iota}, \delta^{\iota} + \frac{\delta^{\iota}}{(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}\right)$ respectively. We now use this partition to define a refinement $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$ of $\mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}$. Let $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}$. We distinguish two different cases.

• **Non-chopping times.** We say that n is a non-chopping time for $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}$ if one (or more) of the following situations occur: (1) $\omega_n \cap \Delta^+ = \emptyset$; (2) n belongs to the binding period associated to some return or escape time $\nu < n$ of ω ; (3) $\omega_n \cap \Delta^+ \neq \emptyset$ but ω_n does not intersect more than two elements of the partition $\mathcal{I}^+$. In all three cases we let $\omega \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$. In cases (1) and (2) and in case (3) if ω_n is not completely contained in Δ^+ , no additional combinatorial information is added to the itinerary of ω . Otherwise, i.e. in case (3) with $\omega_n \subset \Delta^+$, we consider two distinct possibilities: if $\omega_n \cap (\Delta \cup I_{\pm r_{\delta}}) \neq \emptyset$ we say that n is an inessential return time for $\omega \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$, if $\omega_n \subset \Delta^+ \setminus (\Delta \cup I_{\pm r_{\delta}})$ we say that n is an inessential escape time for $\omega \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$. We define the corresponding depth by $r = \max\{|r| : \omega_n \cap I_r \neq \emptyset\}$.

• **Chopping times.** In all remaining cases, i.e. if $\omega_n \cap \Delta^+ \neq \emptyset$ and ω_n intersects at least three elements of $\mathcal{I}^+$, we say that n is a chopping time for $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}$. We define a natural subdivision

$$\omega = \omega^{\ell} \cup \bigcup_{(r,m)} \omega^{(r,m)} \cup \omega^{\rho}.$$

so that each $\omega_n^{(r,m)}$ fully contains a unique element of $\mathcal{I}_+$ (though possibly extending to intersect adjacent elements) and ω_n^{ℓ} and ω_n^{ρ} are components of $\omega_n \setminus \Delta^+$ with $|\omega_n^{\ell}| \geq \delta^{\iota}/(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2$

and $|\omega_n^\rho| \geq \delta^\iota / (\log \delta^{-\iota})^2$. If the connected components of $\omega_n \setminus \Delta^+$ fail to satisfy the above condition on their length we just glue them to the adjacent interval of the form $w_n^{(r,m)}$. By definition we let each of the resulting subintervals of ω be elements of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$. The intervals ω^ℓ, ω^ρ and $\omega^{(r,m)}$ with $|r| < r_\delta$ are called *escape components* and are said to have an *substantial escape* and *essential escape* respectively at time n . The corresponding values of $|r| < r_\delta$ are the associated *essential escape depths*. All other intervals are said to have an *essential return* at time n and the corresponding values of $|r|$ are the associated *essential return depths*. We remark that partition elements $I_{\pm r_\delta}$ do not belong to Δ but we still say that the associated intervals $\omega^{(\pm r_\delta, m)}$ have a return rather than an escape.

This completes the definition of the partition $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$ of $\Omega^{(n-1)}$ and of the function $\mathcal{E}^{(n)}$ on $\Omega^{(n-1)}$. We define

$$(21) \quad \Omega^{(n)} = \{a \in \Omega^{(n-1)} : \mathcal{E}^{(n)}(a) \leq \alpha n\}.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{E}^{(n)}$ is constant on elements of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$. Thus $\Omega^{(n)}$ is the union of elements of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$ and we can define

$$\mathcal{P}^{(n)} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}|_{\Omega^{(n)}}.$$

We shall prove the following

Proposition 4.1. *Conditions $(BR)_n, (EG)_n, (SR)_n, (BD)_n$ all hold for $\Omega^{(n)}$.*

Notice that condition $(BR)_n$ is satisfied by construction, this is precisely the criteria by which the elements of $\Omega^{(n)}$ are chosen, see (21). Thus the key part of the proposition are the remaining three conditions. This is the general step of an induction, it allows us to iterate the construction indefinitely and thus define the set

$$\Omega^* = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \Omega^{(n)}.$$

Notice that in particular for every $a \in \Omega^*$ the map f_a has an exponentially growing derivative along the critical orbit and thus exhibits stochastic dynamics. Our main Theorem therefore reduces to the following

Proposition 4.2. $|\Omega^*| \geq (1 - \eta)|\Omega|$.

We shall prove Proposition 4.1 in Section 6 and Proposition 4.2 in Section 7. First of all however, in Section 5, we obtain several estimates which are used extensively in the proofs of both Propositions. First we make a few remarks concerning the conditions introduced in this section, all of which have played important roles in various results in one-dimensional dynamics.

The exponential growth condition was first introduced by Collet and Eckmann [10] who showed that it implies the existence of an absolutely continuous invariant measure for unimodal maps. Indeed, this is in some sense the most important condition for us as it guarantees that parameters in Ω^* are stochastic. For the purposes of the induction however this is not sufficient. Indeed, as often is the case with inductive arguments, it is easier to assume stronger conditions even if that means that we have to prove stronger estimates.

The slow recurrence condition in the slightly different form $e^{-\sqrt{n}}$ was used by Benedicks and Carleson [6], and in the form given here, in conjunction with the exponential growth condition in [7]. The bounded recurrence condition, in the precise way in which it is stated here, is new, but it is closely related to the *free period* assumption of [7].

5. THE BINDING PERIOD

In this section we make precise the definition of the *binding period* which is part of the combinatorial information given above, and obtain several analytic estimates which play an important role in the following. In accordance with our inductive assumptions, we assume throughout this section that the sets $\Omega^{(k)}$ and $\mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ are defined and the conditions $(BR)_k, (SR)_k, (EG)_k$ and $(BD)_k$ hold for all $k \leq n-1$.

Now let $k \leq n-1$ and suppose that $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ has an essential or inessential return or an essential or inessential escape at time k with return depth r . For each $a \in \omega$ we let

$$(22) \quad p(c_k(a)) = \min\{i : |c_{k+1+i}(a) - c_i(a)| \geq e^{-\alpha_1 i}\}.$$

This is the time for which the future orbit of $c_k(a)$ can be thought of as *shadowing* or *being bound to* the orbit of the critical point (that is, in some sense, the number of iterations for which the orbit of $c(a)$ repeats its early history after the k 'th iterate). Then we define the *binding period* of ω_k as

$$p(\omega_k) = \min_{a \in \omega} \{p(c_k(a))\}.$$

The main result of this section is the following

Lemma 5.1. *For every $a \in \omega$ we have*

$$(23) \quad p \leq \tau_0 \log |c_k(a)|^{-1} \leq \min\{\tau_0(r+1), \tau_0 \alpha_0 k\} < k$$

and

$$(24) \quad |(f^{p+1})'(c_k(a))| \geq \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 \Gamma_1 e^{r(1-\gamma_1)} r^2 \geq \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 \Gamma_1 r^2 e^{-(1+\lambda_0)} e^{\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}(p+1)}.$$

If k is an essential return or an essential escape, then

$$(25) \quad |\omega_{k+p+1}| \geq \Gamma_1 e^{-\gamma_1 r}.$$

We shall prove this result in a sequence of sublemmas. We assume the notation and set up of the Lemma throughout.

5.1. Binding period estimates for individual parameter values. We start by obtaining several estimates related to the “pointwise” binding period $p(c_k(a))$. To simplify the notation we write $x = c_k(a)$ and omit the dependence on the parameter a where there is no risk of confusion.

Sublemma 5.1.1 (Distortion). *For all $a \in \omega$, all $y_0, z_0 \in [x_0, c_0]$ and all $0 \leq j \leq \min\{p, k\}$ we have*

$$\frac{|(f_a^j)'(z_0)|}{|(f_a^j)'(y_0)|} \leq \mathcal{D}_1.$$

We remark that the distortion bound is formally calculated for iterates $j \leq \min\{p, k\}$ because we need to make use of the inductive assumption $(SR)_k$ in the proof. However, we shall show in the next lemma that we always have $p < k$ and therefore the estimates do indeed hold throughout the duration of the binding period.

Proof. By the Mean Value Theorem and the standard inequality $\log(1+x) < x$ for $x > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \log \frac{|(f_a^j)'(z_0)|}{|(f_a^j)'(y_0)|} \right| &= \left| \log \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} \frac{|f'_a(z_i)|}{|f'_a(y_i)|} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \log \left(1 + \frac{|f'(z_i) - f'(y_i)|}{|f'(y_i)|} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \frac{|f'(z_i) - f'(y_i)|}{|f'(y_i)|} \\ &\leq \frac{M_2}{L_2} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \frac{|z_i - y_i|}{|y_i|}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of the binding period we have $|z_i - y_i| \leq e^{-\alpha_1 i}$; by the definition of N_1 in (4) we have $|y_i| \geq 1$ for all $i \leq N_1$; and by $(SR)_k$ and the definition of the binding period in (22) we have $|y_i| \geq e^{-\alpha_0 i} - e^{-\alpha_1 i}$ for $i > N_1$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \frac{|z_i - y_i|}{|y_i|} &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{N_1} e^{-\alpha_1 i} + \sum_{i=N_1+1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\alpha_1 i}}{e^{-\alpha_0 i} - e^{-\alpha_1 i}} \\ &\leq \frac{e^{-\alpha_1}}{1 - e^{-\alpha_1}} + \frac{1}{1 - e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_0)(N_1+1)}} \sum_{i=N_1+1}^{\infty} e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_0)i} \\ &= \frac{e^{-\alpha_1}}{1 - e^{-\alpha_1}} + \frac{e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_0)(N_1+1)}}{(1 - e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_0)(N_1+1)})(1 - e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_0)})}. \end{aligned}$$

The result then follows by the definition of $\mathcal{D}_1$ in (5). $\square$

Sublemma 5.1.2 (Duration). *For all $a \in \omega$ and $p = p(c_k(a))$ we have*

$$(26) \quad p \leq \frac{2 \log |c_k(a)|^{-1} + \log(\mathcal{D}_1 L_1^{-1}) + \lambda_0 + \alpha_1}{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1} \leq \tau_0 \log |c_k(a)|^{-1}.$$

In particular

$$(27) \quad p \leq \min\{\tau_0(r+1), \tau_0 \alpha_0 k\} < k.$$

Proof. Let $\hat{p} = \min\{p, k\}$. We shall show that the above estimates work for $\hat{p}$ and obtain as a corollary that $\hat{p} < k$ and therefore $p = \hat{p}$. For simplicity let $\gamma_0 = [x_0, c_0]$ and $\gamma_j = f^j(\gamma_0)$. Then the Mean Value Theorem and Sublemma 5.1.1 imply $|\gamma_{\hat{p}-1}| \geq \mathcal{D}_1^{-1} |(f^{\hat{p}-1})'(c_0)| |\gamma_0|$,

condition $(EG)_k$ gives $|(f_a^j)'(c_0)| \geq e^{\lambda_0 j}$ for all $j \leq \hat{p}$, the definition of binding gives $|\gamma_{\hat{p}-1}| \leq e^{-\alpha_1(\hat{p}-1)}$, and (2) gives $|\gamma_0| \geq L_1|x|^2$. Combining all these statements gives

$$e^{-\alpha_1(\hat{p}-1)} \geq |\gamma_{\hat{p}-1}| \geq \mathcal{D}_1^{-1}|(f^{\hat{p}-1})'(c_0)||\gamma_0| \geq \mathcal{D}_1^{-1}e^{\lambda_0(\hat{p}-1)}|\gamma_0| \geq \mathcal{D}_1^{-1}L_1e^{\lambda_0(\hat{p}-1)}|x|^2.$$

Rearranging gives $e^{(\lambda_0+\alpha_1)(\hat{p}-1)} \leq \mathcal{D}_1L_1^{-1}|x|^{-2}$, and taking logarithms on both sides we get

$$(28) \quad \hat{p} - 1 \leq \frac{2 \log |x|^{-1} + \log(\mathcal{D}_1L_1^{-1})}{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1}.$$

Now, since $|x| \leq \delta^\iota$ we can use the definition of k_0 in (14) to get

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{p} &\leq \frac{2 \log |x|^{-1} + \log(\mathcal{D}_1L_1^{-1}) + \lambda_0 + \alpha_1}{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1} \left(2 \log |x|^{-1} + \frac{\log(\mathcal{D}_1L_1^{-1}) + \lambda_0 + \alpha_1}{\log \delta^{-\iota}} \log \delta^{-\iota} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1} \left(2 + \frac{\log(\mathcal{D}_1L_1^{-1}) + \lambda_0 + \alpha_1}{\log \delta^{-\iota}} \right) \log |x|^{-1} \\ &\leq \frac{2 + k_0}{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1} \log |x|^{-1} = \tau_0 \log |x|^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By condition $(SR)_k$ we also have $|c_k(a)| \geq e^{-\alpha_0 k}$ we then get

$$(30) \quad \hat{p} \leq \tau_0 \alpha_0 k,$$

which is $< k$ by **(C2)**. In particular, $p = \hat{p} < k$. Moreover, from (29) and the fact that $|c_k(a)| \geq e^{-r}/2$ we also get $p \leq \tau_0(r + \log 2)$. $\square$

Sublemma 5.1.3 (Expansion). *For all $a \in \omega$ and $p = p(c_k(a))$ we have*

$$(31) \quad |(f^{p+1})'(c_k(a))| \geq C_3|c_k(a)|^{\alpha_1\tau_1-1}.$$

Recall that $\alpha_1\tau_1 := 2\alpha_1/(\lambda_0 + \alpha_1)$, see definition in (14), is strictly less than 1 because $\alpha_1 < \lambda_0$ by the choice of α_1 in (3).

Proof. We estimate first of all the average expansion between γ_0 and γ_p . Since $|\gamma_0| \leq L_1^{-1}|x|^2$ by (2) and $|\gamma_p| \geq e^{-\alpha_1 p}$ by the definition of p , we have $|\gamma_p|/|\gamma_0| \geq L_1e^{-\alpha_1 p}|x|^{-2}$. Applying the Mean Value Theorem we conclude that there exist some point $\xi_0 \in \gamma_0$ for which $|(f^p)'(\xi_0)| \geq L_1e^{-\alpha_1 p}|x|^{-2}$. Then, using the bounded distortion Sublemma 5.1.1 it follows that $|(f^p)'(x_0)| \geq \mathcal{D}_1^{-1}L_1e^{-\alpha_1 p}|x|^{-2}$. Finally, using that fact that $|f'(x)| \geq L_1|x|$ we obtain

$$(32) \quad |(f^{p+1})'(x)| = |f'(x)| |(f^p)'(x_0)| \geq \mathcal{D}_1^{-1}L_1^2e^{-\alpha_1 p}|x|^{-1}.$$

Using the upper bound on p from Sublemma 5.1.2 gives

$$e^{-\alpha_1 p} \geq e^{-\alpha_1 \frac{2 \log |x|^{-1} + \log(\mathcal{D}_1L_1^{-1})}{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1}} = (\mathcal{D}_1L_1^{-1})^{\frac{-\alpha_1}{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1}} |x|^{\frac{2\alpha_1}{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1}}.$$

Substituting this into (32) gives the result, recall definition of C_3 in (15). $\square$

5.2. Parameter dependence. We are now almost ready to proof our main Lemma 5.1. This involves some estimates regarding the dependence of images of critical points on the parameter. We shall therefore need the following statement which is of intrinsic interest and of wider scope and will be used again later on in the argument.

Lemma 5.2. *For any $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ and $a \in \omega$ we have*

$$\mathcal{D}_2 \geq \frac{|c'_{k+1}(a)|}{|(f_a^{k+1})'(c_0)|} \geq \mathcal{D}_3^{-1}.$$

In particular, for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k+1$, there exists $\tilde{a} \in \omega$ such that

$$(33) \quad \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3} |(f_{\tilde{a}}^{j-i})'(c_i(\tilde{a}))| \leq \frac{|\omega_j|}{|\omega_i|} \leq \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 |(f_{\tilde{a}}^{j-i})'((c_i(\tilde{a})))|.$$

Proof. Recall that $c_{k+1}(a) = f(c_k(a)) + a$. Therefore, by the chain rule we have

$$\begin{aligned} c'_{k+1}(a) &= 1 + f'(c_k)c'_k(a) \\ &= 1 + f'(c_k)[1 + f'(c_{k-1})c'_{k-1}(a)] \\ &= 1 + f'(c_k) + f'(c_k)f'(c_{k-1})c'_{k-1}(a) \\ &= 1 + f'(c_k) + f'(c_k)f'(c_{k-1})[1 + f'(c_{k-2})c'_{k-2}(a)] \\ &= 1 + f'(c_k) + f'(c_k)f'(c_{k-1}) + f'(c_k)f'(c_{k-1})f'(c_{k-2})c'_{k-2}(a) \\ &= \dots \\ &= 1 + f'(c_k) + f'(c_k)f'(c_{k-1}) + \dots + f'(c_k)f'(c_{k-1}) \dots f'(c_1)f'(c_0). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by $(f^{k+1})'(c_0) = f'(c_k)f'(c_{k-1}) \dots f'(c_1)f'(c_0)$ gives

$$(34) \quad \frac{c'_{k+1}(a)}{(f_a^{k+1})'(c_0)} = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)}.$$

Now let $\tilde{N}$ be as in condition (A4) and in the definition of the constants $\mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_3$ in (6)-(7). Then, for $1 \leq k < \tilde{N}$ we have

$$\left| \frac{c'_{k+1}(a)}{(f_a^{k+1})'(c_0)} \right| = \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| \leq \mathcal{D}_2.$$

Using the fact that by $(EG)_k$ we have $|(f^i)'(c_0)| \geq e^{\lambda_0 i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k+1$, for any $k \geq \tilde{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{c'_{k+1}(a)}{(f_a^{k+1})'(c_0)} \right| &= \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} + \sum_{i=\tilde{N}+1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| \\
&\leq \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| + \left| \sum_{i=\tilde{N}+1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| \\
&\leq \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| + \sum_{i=\tilde{N}+1}^{k+1} e^{-\lambda_0 i} \\
&\leq \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| + \sum_{i=\tilde{N}+1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_0 i} \\
&\leq \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| + \frac{e^{-\lambda_0(\tilde{N}+1)}}{1 - e^{-\lambda_0}} \leq \mathcal{D}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

The lower bound is obtained similarly. If $k < \tilde{N}$ we have

$$\left| \frac{c'_{k+1}(a)}{(f_a^{k+1})'(c_0)} \right| = \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| \geq \mathcal{D}_3^{-1},$$

and if $k \geq \tilde{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{c'_{k+1}(a)}{(f_a^{k+1})'(c_0)} \right| &\geq \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} + \sum_{i=\tilde{N}+1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| \\
&\geq \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| - \left| \sum_{i=\tilde{N}+1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| \\
&\geq \left| 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \frac{1}{(f^i)'(c_0)} \right| - \sum_{i=\tilde{N}+1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_0 i} \geq \mathcal{D}_3^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the first set of inequalities. For the second, consider the composition $c_j \circ c_i^{-1} : \omega_i \rightarrow \omega_j$. By the Mean Value Theorem there exists $\tilde{a} \in \omega$ such that

$$\frac{|\omega_j|}{|\omega_i|} = |(c_j \circ c_i^{-1})'((c_i(\tilde{a})))|.$$

Then by the chain rule and the first set of inequalities we get the desired statement. $\square$

Lemma 5.2 implies that all parameters in a given interval ω satisfy comparable derivative estimates during the binding period $p = p(\omega_k)$. This allows us to extend the expansion estimates at the end of a binding period to parameter for which we do not necessarily have $p(c_k(a)) = p(\omega_k)$, recall that the binding period of the entire interval is defined as the minimum of these binding periods.

Sublemma 5.2.1. *Let $p = p(\omega_k)$. Then, for all $a \in \omega$ we have*

$$(35) \quad |(f^{p+1})'(c_k(a))| \geq \tilde{C}_3 |c_k(a)|^{\alpha_1 \tau_1 - 1}.$$

Proof. For those parameter values $\tilde{a} \in \omega$ such that $p(c_k(\tilde{a})) = p(\omega_k)$, the result follows immediately from Sublemma 5.1.3. Notice that there must exist such a $\tilde{a}$. For a generic a we argue as follows. First of all we consider the iterates coming after the return. For any $a, \tilde{a} \in \omega$, we have

$$(36) \quad \begin{aligned} |(f_a^p)'(c_{k+1}(a))| &\geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_1} |(f_a^p)'(c_0(a))| \quad \text{by Sublemma 5.1.1,} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2} |c'_p(a)| \quad \text{by Lemma 5.2,} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{D} \mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2} |c'_p(\tilde{a})| \quad \text{by the inductive assumption } (BD)_k, \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{D} \mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3} |(f_{\tilde{a}}^p)'(c_0(\tilde{a}))| \quad \text{by Lemma 5.2,} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{D} \mathcal{D}_1^2 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3} |(f_{\tilde{a}}^p)'(c_{k+1}(\tilde{a}))| \quad \text{by Sublemma 5.1.1.} \end{aligned}$$

Now we deal with the actual return iterate. By construction we have $|\omega_k| \leq |c_k(\tilde{a})|/2$. Therefore, using (2), we get

$$(37) \quad |f'(c_k(a))| \geq L_1 |c_k(a)| \geq L_1 (|c_k(\tilde{a})| - |\omega_k|) \geq L_1 |c_k(\tilde{a})|/2 \geq L_1^2 |f'(c_k(\tilde{a}))|/2.$$

Since $|(f^{p+1})'(c_k(a))| = |f'(c_k(a))| |(f^p)'(c_{k+1}(a))|$ and similarly for $\tilde{a}$, (36) and (37) imply

$$(38) \quad |(f^{p+1})'(c_k(a))| \geq \frac{L_1^2}{2 \mathcal{D} \mathcal{D}_1^2 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3} |(f^{p+1})'(c_k(\tilde{a}))|$$

for all $a, \tilde{a} \in \omega$. Now, choosing $\tilde{a}$ such that $p(\omega_k) = p(c_k(\tilde{a}))$ and applying (31) and the fact that $|c_k(a)| \leq 2|c_k(\tilde{a})|$, we get

$$(39) \quad |(f^{p+1})'(c_k(\tilde{a}))| \geq C_3 |c_k(\tilde{a})|^{\alpha_1 \tau_1 - 1} \geq C_3 2^{\alpha_1 \tau_1 - 1} |c_k(a)|^{\alpha_1 \tau_1 - 1}.$$

Substituting (39) into (38) and using the definition of $\tilde{C}_3$ in (15) gives the result. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 5.1. The upper bound (23) on p follows immediately from (26). For the expansion estimates, (35) and the fact that $|c_k(a)| \leq e^{-(r-1)}$, imply

$$|(f^{p+1})'(c_k(a))| \geq \tilde{C}_3 |c_k(a)|^{\alpha_1 \tau_1 - 1} \geq \tilde{C}_3 e^{-(r-1)(\alpha_1 \tau_1 - 1)}.$$

To get the first inequality in (24) it is therefore sufficient to show that

$$(40) \quad \tilde{C}_3 e^{-(r-1)(\alpha_1 \tau_1 - 1)} \geq r^2 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 \Gamma_1 e^{(1-\gamma_1)r}.$$

Rearranging and taking logs we get that (40) holds if and only if

$$(41) \quad \gamma_1 \geq \frac{\log(\Gamma_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 \tilde{C}_3^{-1} e^{\alpha_1 \tau_1 - 1}) + 2 \log r}{r} + \alpha_1 \tau_1.$$

Since the expression on the right hand side is strictly decreasing with r , it is sufficient for this inequality to be verified for $r = \iota \log \delta^{-1}$ which follows from **(C3)**. This gives the first inequality in (24). To get the second inequality in (24) we use the fact that $r > p\tau_0^{-1} - 1$ which comes from $p \leq \tau_0(r + 1)$ in (27), and get

$$\begin{aligned} |(f^{p+1})'(c_k(a))| &\geq \Gamma_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 e^{(1-\gamma_1)r} r^2 \\ &\geq \Gamma_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 e^{p \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}} e^{-(1-\gamma_1)r^2} \\ &= \Gamma_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 e^{(p+1) \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}} e^{-\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}} e^{-(1-\gamma_1)r^2} \\ &= \Gamma_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 r^2 e^{-\frac{(\tau_0+1)(1-\gamma_1)}{\tau_0}} e^{(p+1) \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}}. \end{aligned}$$

We then use the fact that $\tau_0 > 2/(\lambda_0 + \alpha_1)$ and $\alpha_1 < \lambda_0$ by definition, to get

$$\frac{(\tau_0 + 1)(1 - \gamma_1)}{\tau_0} \leq \frac{\tau_0 + 1}{\tau_0} = 1 + \frac{1}{\tau_0} < 1 + \frac{\lambda_0 + \alpha_1}{2} < 1 + \lambda_0.$$

This completes the proof of (24). Now suppose that k is an essential return or escape, in particular $|\omega_k| \geq e^{-r}/r^2$. Therefore Lemma 5.2 implies that there exists some parameter $a \in \omega$ such that

$$|\omega_{k+p+1}| \geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3} |(f^{p+1})'(c_k(a))| |\omega_k| \geq \frac{e^{-r}}{r^2 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3} |(f^{p+1})'(c_k(a))|,$$

and the result follows immediately by (24). $\square$

5.3. Uniform bounds on the sum of all inessential return depths. The following result is essentially a Corollary of Lemma 5.1. It shows that the total length of the binding periods associated to a sequence of inessential returns can be bounded in terms of the return depth of the immediately preceding *essential* return.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}$ and suppose that ω has an essential return with return depth r_0 at some time $\mu_0 \leq n - 1$. Let $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_u$ denote the following inessential returns which occur after time μ_0 and before any subsequent chopping time and before time n . Let p_i , $i = 0, \dots, u$ denote the corresponding binding periods. Then*

$$\sum_{i=0}^u (p_i + 1) \leq \tau r_0.$$

Proof. Since $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_u$ are all returns (to Δ), condition (A1) gives

$$|(f_a^{\mu_{i+1} - (\mu_i + p_i + 1)})'(c_{\mu_i + p_i + 1}(a))| \geq 1$$

for $0 \leq i \leq u - 1$ and $\forall a \in \omega$. Notice that we do not have (and will not need) such an estimate for $i = u$ since we do not have information about the location of ω_n (nor indeed

do we even know if $n \geq \mu_u + p_u + 1$). Equation (24) in Lemma 5 together with the fact that $r_i^2 \geq r_\delta^2 = (\log \delta)^2 \geq e^{-(1+\lambda_0)}$ by condition (C1), gives

$$|(f^{\mu_i+p_i+1})'(c_{\mu_i(a)})| \geq \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 \Gamma_1 e^{\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}(p_i+1)}$$

for all $0 \leq i \leq u$ and $a \in \omega$. Notice that this estimate does include the case $i = u$. Combining these estimates by the chain rule, and applying Lemma 5.2 we then get

$$\frac{|\omega_{\mu_{i+1}}|}{|\omega_{\mu_i}|} \geq \Gamma_1 e^{\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}(p_i+1)} \quad \text{for } i = 0, \dots, u-1, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|\omega_{\mu_u+p_u+1}|}{|\omega_{\mu_0}|} \geq \Gamma_1 e^{\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}(p_u+1)},$$

and therefore

$$\frac{|\omega_{\mu_u+p_u+1}|}{|\omega_{\mu_0}|} = \frac{|\omega_{\mu_u+p_u+1}|}{|\omega_{\mu_u}|} \frac{|\omega_{\mu_u}|}{|\omega_{\mu_{u-1}}|} \dots \frac{|\omega_{\mu_2}|}{|\omega_{\mu_1}|} \frac{|\omega_{\mu_1}|}{|\omega_{\mu_0}|} \geq \Gamma^{u+1} e^{\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0} \sum_{i=0}^u (p_i+1)}.$$

Now since μ_0 is an essential return we have $|\omega_{\mu_0}| \geq e^{-r_0}/r_0^2$ and thus

$$|I| \geq |\omega_{\mu_u+p_u+1}| \geq |\omega_{\mu_0}| \Gamma^{u+1} e^{\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0} \sum_{i=0}^u (p_i+1)} \geq \Gamma^1 e^{\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0} \sum_{i=0}^u (p_i+1)} e^{-r_0}/r_0^2.$$

We have replaced Γ_1^{u+1} by Γ_1 in the inequality because we do not know how many inessential returns there are. There may be none, in which case we have $u = 0$. Taking logs and rearranging we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^u (p_i+1) &\leq \frac{\tau_0}{1-\gamma_1} \log \left(\frac{|I| e^{r_0} r_0^2}{\Gamma_1} \right) \\ (42) \quad &= r_0 \frac{\tau_0}{1-\gamma_1} \left(1 + \frac{\log |I| + 2 \log r_0 - \log \Gamma_1}{r_0} \right) \\ &\leq r_0 \frac{\tau_0}{1-\gamma_1} \left(1 + \frac{\log |I| + 2 \log r_\delta - \log \Gamma_1}{r_\delta} \right) \\ &= \tau r_0. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that the fraction in parenthesis is decreasing in r , therefore r_0 can be replaced by r_δ giving precisely the definition of τ in (16). Notice moreover that

$$(43) \quad \sum_{i=0}^u (p_i+1) \geq p_0+1 > 0,$$

and therefore the above inequality implies *a fortiori* that $\tau > 0$. $\square$

6. POSITIVE EXPONENTS IN DYNAMICAL SPACE

In this section we prove Proposition 4.1. Notice that the combinatorics and the recurrence condition $(BR)_n$ are satisfied for every $a \in \Omega^{(n)}$ by construction. We therefore just need to verify the slow recurrence, exponential growth, and bounded distortion conditions. We shall do this in three separate subsections.

6.1. Slow recurrence.

Lemma 6.1. *For every $a \in \Omega^{(n)}$, $(SR)_n$ holds.*

Proof. The statement clearly holds if n is not an escape or a return or a bound iterate for ω containing a . Now suppose that n is an escape iterate. Then it must be that $n \geq N$ and then (1) implies that $e^{-\alpha_0 n} \leq e^{-\alpha_0 N} < \delta$. Since n is an escape we must have $|c_k(a)| \geq \delta \geq e^{-\alpha_0 N} \geq e^{-\alpha_0 n}$. If n is an essential return the result follows immediately by the bounded recurrence condition $(BR)_k$. If n is an inessential return, it follows immediately from the binding period estimates Lemma 5.3 that its return depth must be less than the return depth of the preceding inessential return and thus in particular satisfy the required estimate. If n belongs to a binding period the same reasoning gives the result. $\square$

6.2. Exponential derivative growth.

Lemma 6.2. *For every $a \in \Omega^{(n)}$, $(EG)_n$ holds.*

Proof. Let $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}$ be the element containing a . If ω has no returns before time n then this implies that $c_k(a) \notin \Delta$ for all $k \leq n$ and therefore we have $|(f^{n+1})'(c_0(a))| \geq e^{\lambda(n+1)} > e^{\lambda_0(n+1)}$ by condition (A1) and the fact that $\lambda > \lambda_0$. If ω has a non-empty sequence of returns before time n , let $\nu_1 < \nu_2 < \dots < \nu_q \leq n$ be all the free (essential and inessential) returns up to n and p_i the corresponding binding period. Lemma 5.3 and the bounded recurrence condition $(BR)_{\nu_q}$ imply

$$(44) \quad \sum_{i=1}^q (p_i + 1) \leq \tau \sum_{\text{essential returns}} r_i(\omega) = \tau \mathcal{E}^{(\nu_q)}(\omega) \leq \tau \alpha \nu_q.$$

Splitting the orbit of c_0 into free and bound iterates and using condition (A1), the binding period estimate (24), and (44), we get

$$(45) \quad \begin{aligned} |(f^{\nu_q})'(c_0)| &\geq e^{\lambda(\nu_q - \sum_{i=1}^q (p_i + 1))} \Gamma_1^q e^{\frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0} \sum_{i=1}^q (p_i + 1)} \\ &\geq \Gamma_1^q e^{\lambda \nu_q - (\lambda - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}) \sum_{i=1}^q (p_i + 1)} \\ &\geq \Gamma_1^q e^{\lambda \nu_q - \tau \alpha \nu_q (\lambda - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0})} \\ &\geq \Gamma_1^q e^{(\lambda - \tau \alpha (\lambda - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0})) \nu_q}. \end{aligned}$$

Then condition $(BR)_{\nu_q}$ implies in particular $|c_k| \geq e^{-(r_q+1)}$ with $r_q \leq \alpha \nu_q$ which, together with (2), implies

$$(46) \quad |f'(c_{\nu_q})| \geq L_1 e^{-\alpha \nu_q - 1}.$$

If $n = \nu_q$, equations (45) and (46) give

$$(47) \quad |(f^{n+1})'(c_0)| \geq L_1 \Gamma_1^q e^{-1} e^{-(\lambda - \tau \alpha (\lambda - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}) - \alpha)} e^{(\lambda - \tau \alpha (\lambda - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}) - \alpha)(n+1)},$$

notice that

$$(48) \quad \lambda - \tau\alpha\left(\lambda - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{\tau_0}\right) - \alpha \geq \lambda_0 \iff \alpha \leq (\lambda - \lambda_0)\left(\tau\left(\lambda - \frac{1 - \gamma_1}{\tau_0}\right) + 1\right).$$

This condition is therefore satisfied by the definition of α in (17). In particular, from (47) we have

$$|(f^{n+1})'(c_0)| \geq L_1 \Gamma_1^q e^{-1-\lambda_0} e^{\lambda_0(n+1)} \geq e^{\lambda_0(n+1)},$$

since $\Gamma_1^q \geq \Gamma_1 \geq L_1^{-1} e^{1+\lambda}$ by (13). This proves the statement in the case $n = \nu_q$.

If $n > \nu_q$, it remains to estimate the derivative along the remaining iterates. We claim that

$$(49) \quad |f^{(n-\nu_q)}(c_{\nu_q+1})| \geq \mathcal{D}_1^{-1} e^{\lambda_0(n-\nu_q)}.$$

Indeed, if $n \leq \nu_q + p_q$, i.e. n belongs to the binding period following the return at time ν_q , then this follows immediately from the inductive assumption $(EG)_{n-\nu_q-1}$ and the bounded distortion during binding periods in Lemma 5.1.1. Otherwise, i.e. if $n > \nu_q + p_q$, we consider two possibilities. If the orbit of c_k never enters Δ between time $\nu_q + 1$ and time n we just ignore the binding period and use (A1) to obtain $|f^{(n-\nu_q-1)}(c_{\nu_q+1})| \geq e^{\lambda(n-\nu_q-1)}$ which clearly implies (49). Alternatively, if the orbit of c_k does enter Δ between time $\nu_q + 1$ and time n we just apply the inductive assumption and the bounded distortion to get an estimate like (49) up to the last time before n that $c_k \in \Delta$ and then apply (A1) to get exponential growth at a rate λ for the remaining iterates; also in this case we obtain (49).

By the chain rule and equations (45)-(49) we then get

$$\begin{aligned} |(f^{n+1})'(c_0)| &\geq \Gamma_1^q e^{(\lambda - \tau\alpha(\lambda - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}))\nu_q} L_1 e^{-\alpha\nu_q-1} \mathcal{D}_1^{-1} e^{\lambda_0(n-\nu_q)} \\ &= \Gamma_1^q L_1 \mathcal{D}_1^{-1} e^{-1-\lambda_0} e^{(\lambda - \tau\alpha(\lambda - \frac{1-\gamma_1}{\tau_0}) - \alpha - \lambda_0)\nu_q} e^{\lambda_0(n+1)} \geq e^{\lambda_0(n+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows, again, by (48) and (13). This completes the proof of Lemma 6.2. $\square$

6.3. Bounded distortion.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\omega \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}$. Then*

$$\frac{|c'_k a|}{|c'_k b|} \leq \mathcal{D}$$

for all $a, b \in \omega$ and all $k \leq \nu_q + p_q + 1$ where $\nu_q \leq n$ is the last essential or inessential return, or the last essential or inessential escape of ω and p_q is the corresponding binding period. If $n > \nu_q + p_q + 1$ then the same statement holds for all $k \leq n$ restricted to any subinterval $\bar{\omega} \subseteq \omega$ such that $|\bar{\omega}_k| \subseteq \Delta^+$.

By Lemma 5.2 it is sufficient to show that

$$(50) \quad \frac{|(f_a^k)'(c_0)|}{|(f_b^k)'(c_0)|} \leq \frac{\mathcal{D}}{\mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3}.$$

Notice that, strictly speaking, Lemma 5.2 is stated for $k \leq n - 1$ but this is not an issue here since the actual assumptions used and therefore the conclusions of the lemma clearly

apply up to time k . Equation (50) essentially says that critical orbits with the same combinatorics satisfy comparable derivative estimates. By standard arguments (see also the proof of Sublemma 5.1.1), we have

$$\log \frac{|(f_a^k)'(c_0)|}{|(f_b^k)'(c_0)|} \leq \frac{M_2}{L_2} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} D_j \quad \text{where} \quad D_j = \frac{|\omega_j|}{d(\omega_j)}$$

and $d(\omega_j) = \inf_{a \in \omega} |c_j(a)|$. Let $0 < \nu_1 < \dots < \nu_q \leq n$ be the sequence of essential and inessential returns and essential and inessential escapes of ω . By construction there is a unique element I_{ρ_i, m_i} in $\mathcal{I}^+$ associated to each ν_i . Let p_i be the length of the binding period associated to ν_i . For notational convenience define ν_0 and p_0 so that $\nu_0 + p_0 + 1 = 0$. We suppose first that $k \leq \nu_q + p_q + 1$. Then write

$$(51) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} D_j \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\nu_q + p_q} D_j = \sum_{i=0}^{q-1} \sum_{\nu_i + p_i + 1}^{\nu_{i+1} + p_{i+1}} D_j.$$

Notice that we have divided the itinerary of ω into a finite number of blocks corresponding to pieces of itinerary starting immediately after a binding period and going through to the end of the following binding period. In the next sublemma we obtain a bound for the sum over each individual block.

Sublemma 6.3.1. *For each $i = 0, \dots, q-1$ we have*

$$(52) \quad \sum_{\nu_i + p_i + 1}^{\nu_{i+1} + p_{i+1}} D_j \leq \hat{D} |\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}| e^{\rho_{i+1}}.$$

Proof. We start first of all by subdividing the sum further into iterates corresponding to: *i)* the free iterates between the end of the binding period and the following return, *ii)* the return, *iii)* the binding period following the return.

$$(53) \quad \sum_{\nu_i + p_i + 1}^{\nu_{i+1} + p_{i+1}} D_j = \sum_{\nu_i + p_i + 1}^{\nu_{i+1} - 1} D_j + D_{\nu_{i+1}} + \sum_{\nu_{i+1} + 1}^{\nu_{i+1} + p_{i+1}} D_j.$$

We shall estimate each of the three terms in separate arguments. For the first, notice that since $\omega_{\nu_{i+1}} \subseteq \hat{I}_{\rho_i, m} \subset \Delta^+$, condition (A1) implies $|(f^{\nu_{i+1}-j})'c_j(a)| \geq C_1 e^{\lambda(\nu_{i+1}-j)}$. Therefore by Lemma 5.2 we have $|\omega_j| \leq C_1^{-1} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 e^{-\lambda(\nu_{i+1}-j)} |\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}|$. Moreover $d(\omega_j) \geq \delta^\iota - 2I_{r_{\delta^+}}/r_{\delta^+}^2 \geq \delta^\iota/2$, therefore, using also the fact that $\delta^\iota \geq e^{-\rho_{i+1}}$, we have

$$(54) \quad \sum_{j=\nu_i + p_i + 1}^{\nu_{i+1} - 1} D_j \leq 2C_1^{-1} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 \sum_{j=\nu_i + p_i + 1}^{\nu_{i+1} - 1} e^{-\lambda(\nu_{i+1}-j)} |\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}| \delta^{-\iota} \leq \frac{2C_1^{-1} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}} |\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}| e^{\rho_{i+1}}.$$

For the second term we immediately have

$$(55) \quad D_{\nu_{i+1}} \leq 2|\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}| e^{\rho_{i+1}}.$$

since $D_{\nu_{i+1}}$ is the supremum of $|\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}|/|c_{\nu_{i+1}}|$ over all points $c_{\nu_{i+1}}$ in $\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}$ and $|c_{\nu_{i+1}}| \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-\rho_{i+1}}$ by definition.

The estimation for the third term is the trickiest, or at least the least intuitive. By Lemma 5.2 we have, for all $j \in [\nu_{i+1} + 1, \nu_{i+1} + p_{i+1}]$,

$$(56) \quad |\omega_j| \leq \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 |\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}| \sup_{a \in \omega} \{|(f_a^{j-\nu_{i+1}})'(c_{\nu_{i+1}})(a)|\}.$$

We therefore need an *upper bound* for

$$|(f_a^{j-\nu_{i+1}})'(c_{\nu_{i+1}})(a)| = |(f^{j-\nu_{i+1}-1})'(c_{\nu_{i+1}+1}(a))| \cdot |f'_a(c_{\nu_{i+1}}(a))|.$$

For the second term in the product we just have $|f'_a(c_{\nu_{i+1}}(a))| \leq 2L_1^{-1}e^{-\rho_{i+1}}$ by (2). Thus, substituting into (56) gives

$$(57) \quad |\omega_j| \leq \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 2L_1^{-1} \sup_{a \in \omega} \{|(f^{j-\nu_{i+1}-1})'(c_{\nu_{i+1}+1}(a))|\} |\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}| e^{-\rho_{i+1}}.$$

Thus it only remains to get an upper bound for the derivative during the binding period. Fix $a \in \omega$ and let $\gamma_{j-\nu_{i+1}-1} := |c_{j-\nu_{i+1}-1}(a) - c_j(a)|$. Then we have $|\gamma_0| \geq L_1 e^{-2\rho_{i+1}}$ and, by the definition of binding periods, $|\gamma_{j-\nu_{i+1}-1}| \leq e^{-\alpha_1(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)}$. Therefore using the Mean Value Theorem and Lemma 5.1.1 which says that all derivatives are comparable during the binding period, we get

$$|(f^{j-\nu_{i+1}-1})'(c_{\nu_{i+1}+1}(a))| \leq \mathcal{D}_1 |\gamma_{j-\nu_{i+1}-1}| / |\gamma_0| \leq \mathcal{D}_1 e^{-\alpha_1(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)} L_1^{-1} e^{2\rho_{i+1}}.$$

Substituting this into (57) then gives

$$(58) \quad |\omega_j| \leq 2\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 L_1^{-2} e^{-\alpha_1(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)} |\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}| e^{\rho_{i+1}}.$$

To bound $d(\omega_j)$ we just observe that the definition of binding period and the slow recurrence condition $(SR)_{j-\nu_{i+1}-1}$ imply, for $j > \nu_{i+1} + 1$,

$$(59) \quad \begin{aligned} |c_j(a)| &\geq |c_{j-\nu_{i+1}-1}(a)| - e^{-\alpha_1(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)} \\ &\geq e^{-\alpha_0(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)} - e^{-\alpha_1(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)} = e^{-\alpha_0(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)} (1 - e^{-(\alpha_1-\alpha_0)(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)}) \\ &\geq e^{-\alpha_0(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)} (1 - e^{-(\alpha_1-\alpha_0)}). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for $j = \nu_{i+1} + 1$ we just have $|c_j(a)| \geq 1 \geq e^{-\alpha_0(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)} (1 - e^{-(\alpha_1-\alpha_0)})$ so, formally, the inequality holds in this case also. Thus, (58) and (59) and the fact that $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_0$ give

$$(60) \quad \frac{|\omega_j|}{d(\omega_j)} \leq \frac{2\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 L_1^{-2} e^{-\alpha_1(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)} |\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}| e^{\rho_{i+1}}}{e^{-\alpha_0(j-\nu_{i+1}-1)} (1 - e^{-(\alpha_1-\alpha_0)})} \leq \frac{2\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 L_1^{-2} |\omega_{\nu_{i+1}}| e^{\rho_{i+1}}}{1 - e^{-(\alpha_1-\alpha_0)}}.$$

Substituting (54), (55) and (60) into (53) and using the definition of $\hat{D}$ in (10) gives the statement in Sublemma (6.3.1). $\square$

Substituting (52) in (51) we get

$$(61) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\nu_q+p_q} D_j = \sum_{i=0}^{q-1} \sum_{\nu_i+p_i+1}^{\nu_{i+1}+p_{i+1}} D_j \leq \hat{D} \sum_{i=1}^q |\omega_{\nu_i}| e^{\rho_i}.$$

Now we subdivide the sum on the right hand side into partial sums corresponding to return times with the same return depth r denoted by $i : \rho_i = r$:

$$(62) \quad \sum_{i=1}^q |\omega_{\nu_i}| e^{\rho_i} = \sum_{r \geq r_{\delta+}} e^r \sum_{i: \rho_i=r} |\omega_{\nu_i}|.$$

In the next sublemma we estimate the total contribution of of returns corresponding to a fixed return depth r .

Sublemma 6.3.2. *For any $r \geq r_{\delta+}$,*

$$\sum_{i: \rho_i=r} |\omega_{\nu_i}| \leq \left(2 + e \frac{(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}{(\log \delta^{-\iota} - 1)^2} \right) \frac{e^{-r}}{r^2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{C_1^{-1} \delta^{\iota(1-\gamma_1)}}{(\log \delta^{\iota})^2} \right)^j.$$

Proof. Let $\mu_j = \nu_{i_j}, j = 1, \dots, m$ be the subsequence of returns and escapes with return depths equal to r . Using Lemma 5.1 and condition (A1) we have for all $a \in \omega$ and $j = 1, \dots, m-1$,

$$|(f_a^{\mu_{i+1}-\mu_i})'(c_{\mu_i}(a))| \geq C_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 e^{(1-\gamma_1)r} r^2 \geq C_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 e^{(1-\gamma_1)r_{\delta+}} r_{\delta+}^2.$$

Therefore by Lemma 5.2, $|\omega_{\mu_i}|/|\omega_{\mu_{i+1}}| \leq C_1^{-1} \delta^{\iota(1-\gamma_1)}/(\log \delta^{\iota})^2$ and

$$\sum_{j=1}^m |\omega_{\mu_j}| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{C_1^{-1} \delta^{\iota(1-\gamma_1)}}{(\log \delta^{\iota})^2} \right)^j |\omega_{\mu_m}| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{C_1^{-1} \delta^{\iota(1-\gamma_1)}}{(\log \delta^{\iota})^2} \right)^j |\omega_{\mu_m}|.$$

Recall that ω_m possibly spreads across three contiguous elements of $\mathcal{I}^+$. Two of these have length at most e^{-r}/r^2 and the third one has length at most $e^{-(r-1)}/(r-1)^2 \leq (er^2/(r-1)^2)(e^{-r}/r^2) \leq (er_{\delta+}^2/(r_{\delta+}-1)^2)(e^{-r}/r^2)$. This gives

$$|\omega_{\mu_m}| \leq \left(2 + e \frac{(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}{(\log \delta^{-\iota} - 1)^2} \right) \frac{e^{-r}}{r^2}.$$

□

Notice that the convergence of the sum on the right hand side is guaranteed by the definition of γ_1 in (9). Indeed some straightforward rearrangements shows that condition (9) implies that $C_1^{-1} \delta^{\iota(1-\gamma_1)}/(\log \delta^{\iota})^2 < 1$.

Substituting the estimate of Sublemma 6.3.2 into (62) now gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^q |\omega_{\nu_i}| e^{\rho_i} = \sum_{r \geq r_{\delta+}} e^r \sum_{i: \rho_i=r} |\omega_{\nu_i}| \leq \sum_{r \geq r_{\delta+}} \left[\left(2 + e \frac{(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}{(\log \delta^{-\iota} - 1)^2} \right) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{C_1^{-1} \delta^{\iota(1-\gamma_1)}}{(\log \delta^{\iota})^2} \right)^j \right] \frac{1}{r^2}.$$

Summing over r and substituting into (61) then gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{\nu_q+p_q} D_j &\leq \hat{D} \left[\left(2 + e \frac{(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}{(\log \delta^{-\iota} - 1)^2} \right) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{C_1^{-1} \delta^{\iota(1-\gamma_1)}}{(\log \delta^{\iota})^2} \right)^j \right] \frac{1}{r_{\delta+} - 1} \\ &= \hat{D} \left[\left(2 + e \frac{(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}{(\log \delta^{-\iota} - 1)^2} \right) \frac{(\log \delta^{\iota})^2}{(\log \delta^{\iota})^2 - C_1^{-1} \delta^{\iota(1-\gamma_1)}} \right] \frac{1}{\log \delta^{-\iota} - 1} = \hat{D} \hat{\hat{D}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 6.2 for $k \leq \nu_q + p_q + 1$. If $k > \nu_q + p_q + 1$ we consider the additional terms D_j restricting ourselves to some subinterval $\bar{\omega} \subset \omega$ with $\bar{\omega}_k \subseteq \Delta^+$. Clearly the preceding estimates are unaffected by this restriction. Using (A1) and Lemma 5.2 we have

$$|\bar{\omega}_j| \leq C_1^{-1} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 e^{-\lambda(k-j)} |\bar{\omega}_k| \leq C_1^{-1} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 e^{-\lambda(k-j)} \delta^\iota,$$

and therefore, using also the fact that $|c_j(a)| \geq \delta^\iota$ since $\omega_j \cap \Delta^+ = \emptyset$, we get

$$\sum_{j=\nu_q+p_q+1}^{k-1} D_j \leq C_1^{-1} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 \sum_{j=\nu_q+p_q+1}^{k-1} e^{-\lambda(k-j)} \leq C_1^{-1} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda i} = \frac{C_1^{-1} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 e^{-\lambda}}{1 - e^{-\lambda}}.$$

7. POSITIVE MEASURE IN PARAMETER SPACE

In this section we prove Proposition 4.2. We divide the proof into 4 sections.

7.1. Large deviations. Recall first the definition of $\Omega^{(n)}$ in (21):

$$\Omega^{(n)} = \{a \in \Omega^{(n-1)} : \mathcal{E}^{(n)}(a) \leq \alpha n\}.$$

We will show here that the *average value* of $\mathcal{E}^{(n)}$ on $\Omega^{(n-1)}$ is *low* and therefore *most* parameter in $\Omega^{(n-1)}$ make it into $\Omega^{(n)}$. More precisely, let γ, γ_2 be as in Section 2.2, then we have the following

Proposition 7.1. *For every $n \geq 1$,*

$$\int_{\Omega^{(n-1)}} e^{\gamma_2 \mathcal{E}^{(n)}} \leq \left(1 + \sum_{R \geq r_\delta} e^{(\gamma-1)R}\right)^n |\Omega|.$$

We will prove this proposition in the next three sections. First we show how, by a simple large deviation argument, it implies Proposition 4.2 and therefore our Main Theorem. The definition of $\Omega^{(n)}$ gives

$$|\Omega^{(n-1)}| - |\Omega^{(n)}| = |\Omega^{(n-1)} \setminus \Omega^{(n)}| = |\{\omega \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)} = \mathcal{Q}^{(n)} : e^{\gamma_2 \mathcal{E}^{(n)}} \geq e^{\gamma_2 \alpha n}\}|.$$

Therefore, using Chebychev's inequality (large deviations) and Proposition 7.1 we have

$$|\Omega^{(n-1)}| - |\Omega^{(n)}| \leq e^{-\gamma_2 \alpha n} \int_{\Omega^{(n-1)}} e^{\gamma_2 \mathcal{E}^{(n)}} \leq \left[e^{-\gamma_2 \alpha} \left(1 + \sum_{R \geq r_\delta} e^{(\gamma-1)R}\right) \right]^n |\Omega|,$$

which implies, recall the definition of $\tilde{\eta}$ in Section 2.2,

$$|\Omega^{(n)}| \geq |\Omega^{(n-1)}| - \left[e^{-\gamma_2 \alpha} \left(1 + \sum_{R \geq r_\delta} e^{(\gamma-1)R}\right) \right]^n |\Omega| = |\Omega^{(n-1)}| - \tilde{\eta} |\Omega|.$$

Iterating this expression and using the fact that no exclusions are made before time N , and using also the definition of η , we have

$$|\Omega^*| \geq \left(1 - \sum_{j=N}^{\infty} \left[e^{-\gamma_2 \alpha} \left(1 + \sum_{R \geq r_\delta} e^{(\gamma-1)R}\right) \right]^j \right) |\Omega| = (1 - \eta) |\Omega|.$$

7.2. Renormalization properties of the combinatorics. The proof of Proposition 7.1 is quite subtle. In this section we give an alternative combinatorial description of the parameters in $\Omega^{(n-1)}$ and state a key technical Proposition 7.2 in terms of this combinatorial description. This description is crucial to the argument and highlights some remarkable renormalization properties of the construction. We shall also show how Proposition 7.2 implies Proposition 7.1.

Recall that $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$ is the partition of $\Omega^{(n-1)}$ which takes into account the dynamics at time n and which restricts to the partition $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}$ of $\Omega^{(n)}$ after the exclusion of a certain elements of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$. To each $\omega \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$ is associated a sequence $0 = \eta_0 < \eta_1 < \dots < \eta_s \leq n$, $s = s(\omega) \geq 0$ of escape times and a corresponding sequence of escaping components $\omega \subseteq \omega^{(\eta_s)} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \omega^{(\eta_0)}$ with $\omega^{(\eta_i)} \subseteq \Omega^{(\eta_i)}$ and $\omega^{(\eta_i)} \in \mathcal{P}^{(\eta_i)}$. To simplify the formalism we also define some “fake” escapes by letting $\omega^{(\eta_i)} = \omega$ for all $s+1 \leq i \leq n$. In this way we have a well defined parameter interval $\omega^{(\eta_i)}$ associated to $\omega \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$ for each $0 \leq i \leq n$. Notice that for two intervals $\omega, \tilde{\omega} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$ and any $0 \leq i \leq n$, the corresponding intervals $\omega^{(\eta_i)}$ and $\tilde{\omega}^{(\eta_i)}$ are either disjoint or coincide. Then we define

$$Q^{(i)} = \bigcup_{\omega \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}} \omega^{(\eta_i)}$$

and let $\mathcal{Q}^{(i)} = \{\omega^{(\eta_i)}\}$ denote the natural partition of $Q^{(i)}$ into intervals of the form $\omega^{(\eta_i)}$. Notice that $\Omega^{(n-1)} = Q^{(n)} \subseteq \dots \subseteq Q^{(0)} = \Omega^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{Q}^{(n)} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$ since the number s of escape times is always strictly less than n and therefore in particular $\omega^{(\eta_n)} = \omega$ for all $\omega \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}$. For a given $\omega = \omega^{(\eta_i)} \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i)}$, $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ we let

$$Q^{(i+1)}(\omega) = \{\omega' = \omega^{(\eta_{i+1})} \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)} : \omega' \subseteq \omega\}$$

denote all the elements of $\mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}$ which are contained in ω and let $\mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega)$ denote the corresponding partition. Then we define a function $\Delta\mathcal{E}^{(i)} : Q^{(i+1)}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by

$$\Delta\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(a) = \mathcal{E}^{(\eta_{i+1})}(a) - \mathcal{E}^{(\eta_i)}(a).$$

This gives the total sum of all essential return depths associated to the itinerary of the element $\omega' \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega)$ containing a , between the escape at time η_i and the escape at time η_{i+1} . Clearly $\Delta\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(a)$ is constant on elements of $\mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega)$. Finally we let

$$\mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega, R) = \{\omega' \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)} : \omega' \subseteq \omega, \Delta\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\omega') = R\}.$$

Notice that the entire construction given here depends on n . The main motivation for this construction and is the following

Proposition 7.2. *For all $i \leq n-1$, $\omega \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i)}$ and $R \geq 0$ we have*

$$\sum_{\tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega, R)} |\tilde{\omega}| \leq e^{(\gamma_1 + \gamma_0 - 1)R} |\omega|.$$

This says that the probability of accumulating a large total return depth between one escape and the next is exponentially small. The strategy for proving this result is straightforward. We show that the size of each partition element $\omega' \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega, R)$ is exponentially

small in R and then use a combinatorial argument to show that the total number of such elements cannot be too large. The proposition follows immediately from Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2 in the next two sections. First however we show how Proposition 7.2 implies Proposition 7.1.

Proof of Proposition 7.1 assuming Proposition 7.2. Notice first of all that

$$(63) \quad \int_{\Omega^{(n-1)}} e^{\gamma_2 \mathcal{E}^{(n)}} = \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{Q}^{(n)}} e^{\gamma_2 \mathcal{E}^{(n)}(\omega)} |\omega|.$$

Thus it is sufficient to bound the right hand side. Let $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, and $\omega \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i)}$ and recall that $\mathcal{E}^{(n)} = \Delta \mathcal{E}^{(0)} + \dots + \Delta \mathcal{E}^{(n-1)}$ and $\Delta \mathcal{E}^{(i)}$ is constant on elements of $\mathcal{Q}^{(i)}$. Then we write

$$(64) \quad \sum_{\omega' \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega)} e^{\gamma_2 \Delta \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\omega')} |\omega'| = \sum_{\omega' \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega, 0)} |\omega'| + \sum_{R \geq r_\delta} e^{\gamma_2 R} \sum_{\omega' \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega, R)} |\omega'|.$$

For the first term in the sum we just use the trivial bound

$$(65) \quad \sum_{\omega' \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega, 0)} |\omega'| \leq |\omega|.$$

For the second, we use Proposition 7.2 and the definition of γ to get

$$(66) \quad \sum_{R \geq r_\delta} e^{\gamma_2 R} \sum_{\omega' \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega, R)} |\omega'| \leq \sum_{R \geq r_\delta} e^{(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - 1)R} |\omega| = \sum_{R \geq r_\delta} e^{(\gamma - 1)R} |\omega|.$$

Substituting (64) and (65) into (63) we get

$$(67) \quad \sum_{\omega' \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega)} e^{\gamma_2 \Delta \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\omega')} |\omega'| \leq \left(1 + \sum_{R \geq r_\delta} e^{(\gamma - 1)R} \right) |\omega|.$$

Now, to obtain a bound for (63) recall that by construction each $\omega^{(n)} \in \mathcal{Q}^{(n)}$ belongs to a nested sequence of intervals $\omega^{(n)} \subseteq \omega^{(n-1)} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \omega^{(0)} = \Omega$ which each ω_i belonging to $\mathcal{Q}^{(i)}(\omega^{(i-1)})$ for $n \geq i \geq 1$. Therefore we can write (63) as

$$\sum_{\omega^{(1)} \in \mathcal{Q}^{(1)}(\omega^{(0)})} e^{\gamma_2 \Delta \mathcal{E}^{(0)}(\omega^{(1)})} \sum_{\omega^{(2)} \in \mathcal{Q}^{(2)}(\omega^{(1)})} e^{\gamma_2 \Delta \mathcal{E}^{(1)}(\omega^{(2)})} \dots \sum_{\omega^{(n-1)} \in \mathcal{Q}^{(n-1)}(\omega^{(n-2)})} e^{\gamma_2 \Delta \mathcal{E}^{(n-1)}(\omega^{(n-1)})} \sum_{\omega = \omega^{(n)} \in \mathcal{Q}^{(n)}(\omega^{(n-1)})} e^{\gamma_2 \Delta \mathcal{E}^{(n-1)}(\omega^{(n)})} |\omega|.$$

Notice the *nested* nature of the expression. Applying (67) repeatedly gives

$$\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{Q}^{(n)}} e^{\gamma_2 \mathcal{E}^{(n)}(\omega)} |\omega| \leq \left(1 + \sum_{R \geq r_\delta} e^{(\gamma - 1)R} \right)^n |\Omega|.$$

□

7.3. Metric estimates.

Lemma 7.1. *For all $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, $\omega \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i)}$, $R \geq 0$ and $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega, R)$ we have*

$$|\tilde{\omega}| \leq e^{(\gamma_1-1)R} |\omega|.$$

Proof. From the construction of $\tilde{\omega}$ there is a nested sequence of intervals

$$\tilde{\omega} = \omega^{(\nu_{s+1})} \subseteq \omega^{(\nu_s)} \subseteq \dots \subseteq \omega^{(\nu_1)} \subseteq \omega^{(\nu_0)} = \omega$$

where ω has an escape at time ν_0 , each $\omega^{(\nu_j)}$, $j = 1, \dots, s$ has an essential return at time ν_j (intuitively $\omega^{(\nu_j)}$ is created as a consequence of the intersection of $\omega^{(\nu_{j-1})}$ with Δ at time ν_j). Write

$$(68) \quad \frac{|\tilde{\omega}|}{|\omega|} = \frac{|\omega^{(\nu_1)}|}{|\omega^{(\nu_0)}|} \frac{|\omega^{(\nu_2)}|}{|\omega^{(\nu_1)}|} \dots \frac{|\omega^{(\nu_s)}|}{|\omega^{(\nu_{s-1})}|} \frac{|\tilde{\omega}|}{|\omega^{(\nu_s)}|}.$$

We shall estimate the right hand side of (68) term by term. We start by considering the terms $|\omega^{(\nu_{j+1})}|/|\omega^{(\nu_j)}|$ for $j = 1, \dots, s-1$ for which both ν_j and ν_{j+1} are essential returns. The idea is to compare the two parameter intervals by comparing their images and applying the bounded distortion condition. In this case we choose to compare their images at some intermediate time between the return at time ν_j and the return at time ν_{j+1} , more specifically at the end of the binding period following the return at time ν_j . Thus, using the bounded distortion condition we have

$$\frac{|\omega^{(\nu_{j+1})}|}{|\omega^{(\nu_j)}|} = \frac{|c'_{\nu_j+p_j+1}(a)|}{|c'_{\nu_j+p_j+1}(b)|} \cdot \frac{|\omega_{\nu_j+p_j+1}^{(\nu_{j+1})}|}{|\omega_{\nu_j+p_j+1}^{(\nu_j)}|} < \mathcal{D} \frac{|\omega_{\nu_j+p_j+1}^{(\nu_{j+1})}|}{|\omega_{\nu_j+p_j+1}^{(\nu_j)}|}.$$

To bound the numerator we use Lemma 5.1 to get

$$|\omega_{\nu_j+p_j+1}^{(\nu_j)}| \geq \Gamma_1 e^{-\gamma_1 r_j}.$$

To bound the denominator notice that there may (or may not) be a sequence of inessential returns between time $\nu_j + p_j + 1$ and time ν_{j+1} . In any case, the accumulated derivative taken over all free and bound periods is ≥ 1 . Therefore, using (33), condition (A1) and Lemma 5.1 we get

$$|\omega_{\nu_{j+1}}^{(\nu_{j+1})}| \geq C_1 \mathcal{D}_2^{-1} \mathcal{D}_3^{-1} |\omega_{\nu_j+p_j+1}^{(\nu_{j+1})}|.$$

Thus, by the definition of Γ_1 in (13),

$$(69) \quad \frac{|\omega_{\nu_{j+1}}^{(\nu_{j+1})}|}{|\omega_{\nu_j+p_j+1}^{(\nu_j)}|} \leq \mathcal{D} \frac{|\omega_{\nu_j+p_j+1}^{(\nu_{j+1})}|}{|\omega_{\nu_j+p_j+1}^{(\nu_j)}|} \leq \frac{\mathcal{D} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3}{\Gamma_1 C_1} e^{-r_{j+1} + \gamma_1 r_j} \leq e^{-r_{j+1} + \gamma_1 r_j}.$$

For the last term in ratios we just use the trivial bound

$$|\tilde{\omega}| \leq |\omega^{(\nu_s)}|,$$

and so we get

$$(70) \quad \frac{|\tilde{\omega}|}{|\omega|} \leq \frac{|\omega^{(\nu_1)}|}{|\omega^{(\nu_0)}|} e^{\sum_{j=1}^{s-1} -r_{j+1} + \gamma_1 r_j} = \frac{|\omega^{(\nu_1)}|}{|\omega^{(\nu_0)}|} e^{r_1 - \gamma_1 r_s + \sum_{j=1}^s (\gamma_1 - 1) r_j}.$$

Estimates for $|\omega^{(\nu_1)}|/|\omega^{(\nu_0)}|$ are different from the other cases, in principle, since ν_0 is an escape and not a return time. However, if ν_0 is an *essential escape* then we can actually apply the binding period estimates and, using exactly the same arguments as above we get $|\omega^{(\nu_1)}|/|\omega^{(\nu_0)}| \leq e^{-r_1+\gamma_1 r_0}$ and substituting this into (70) and using the fact that $r_0 < r_s$ we get the statement in the Lemma in this case.

It remains to consider the case in which ν_0 is a *substantial escape*, i.e. $\omega_{\nu_0}^{(\nu_0)}$ lies outside Δ^+ and satisfies $|\omega_{\nu_0}^{(\nu_0)}| \geq \delta^\iota/(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2$. We consider two separate cases depending on whether its image $\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)}$ satisfies $\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)} \subset \Delta^+$ or not. Suppose first that $\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)} \subset \Delta^+$. Then we can apply the bounded distortion as above and for some $a \in \omega^{(\nu_0)}$ and $b \in \omega^{(\nu_1)}$ we get

$$(71) \quad \frac{|\omega^{(\nu_1)}|}{|\omega^{(\nu_0)}|} = \frac{|c'_{\nu_1}(a)|}{|c'_{\nu_1}(b)|} \cdot \frac{|\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_1)}|}{|\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)}|} < \mathcal{D} \frac{|\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_1)}|}{|\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)}|} \leq \frac{\mathcal{D}e^{-r_1}}{|\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)}|}.$$

To bound the denominator we use once more condition (A1) and (33) to get

$$(72) \quad |\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)}| \geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3} \min_{a \in \omega^{(\nu_0)}} \{ |(f^{\nu_1-\nu_0})'(c_{\nu_0}(a))| \} |\omega_{\nu_0}^{(\nu_0)}| \geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3} \frac{\delta^\iota}{(\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}.$$

Substituting (72) into (71) and then (71) into (70), and using the fact that $r_s \geq r_\delta = \log \delta^{-1}$, we get

$$(73) \quad \frac{|\tilde{\omega}|}{|\omega|} \leq \mathcal{D} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 \frac{e^{-\gamma_1 r_s} (\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}{\delta^\iota} e^{(\gamma_1-1)R} \leq \frac{\mathcal{D} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3}{C_1} \frac{\delta^{\gamma_1} (\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}{\delta^\iota} e^{(\gamma_1-1)R}.$$

By straightforward rearrangement and taking logs we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{D} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3}{C_1} \frac{\delta^{\gamma_1} (\log \delta^{-\iota})^2}{\delta^\iota} \leq 1 \iff \gamma_1 \geq \iota + \frac{\log(\mathcal{D} \mathcal{D}_2 \mathcal{D}_3 C_1^{-1}) + 2 \log \log \delta^{-\iota}}{\log \delta^{-1}}.$$

The inequality on the right is satisfied by (C3), and thus we obtain our result in this case. Now, if $\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)} \not\subset \Delta^+$, the bounded distortion result applies only to the subinterval $\bar{\omega}^{(\nu_0)} \subset \omega^{(\nu_0)}$ such that $\bar{\omega}_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)} \subset \Delta^+$ and we get

$$\frac{|\omega^{(\nu_1)}|}{|\bar{\omega}^{(\nu_0)}|} = \frac{|c'_{\nu_1}(a)|}{|c'_{\nu_1}(b)|} \cdot \frac{|\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_1)}|}{|\bar{\omega}_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)}|} < \mathcal{D} \frac{|\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_1)}|}{|\bar{\omega}_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)}|} \leq \frac{\mathcal{D}e^{-r_1}}{|\bar{\omega}_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)}|}.$$

However in this case recall that $\omega_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)}$ necessarily intersects Δ since ν_1 is an essential return time for $\omega^{(\nu_1)} \subset \omega^{(\nu_0)}$. Therefore we get immediately $|\bar{\omega}_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)}| \geq \delta^\iota/2$ using simply the observation that $\bar{\omega}_{\nu_1}^{(\nu_0)}$ intersects both $\partial\Delta^+$ and $\partial\Delta$. The final estimate follows as in the previous paragraph. $\square$

7.4. The counting argument.

Lemma 7.2. *For all $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, $\omega \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i)}$ and $R \geq r_\delta$, we have*

$$\#\mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega, R) \leq e^{\gamma_0 R}.$$

Before starting the proof, recall that each $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega, R)$ has a combinatorial itinerary, associated to the iterates between the i 'th escape at time η_i and the $i+1$ 'th escape at time η_{i+1} , specified by a sequence

$$(74) \quad (\pm r_1, m_1), (\pm r_2, m_2), \dots, (\pm r_s, m_s)$$

with

$$(75) \quad s \geq 1, \quad |r_1| + \dots + |r_s| = R, \quad |r_j| \geq r_\delta, \quad m_j \in [1, r_j^2], \quad j = 1, \dots, s.$$

The combinatorics is not unique but the multiplicity of partition elements with the same combinatorics can be controlled. Indeed this is essentially the main reason for introducing the sets $\mathcal{Q}^{(i)}$.

Sublemma 7.2.1. *The cardinality of elements of $\mathcal{Q}^{(i+1)}(\omega, R)$ having the same combinatorial itinerary is at most r_δ^3 .*

Proof. The first time, after time η_i , that ω intersects Δ^+ in a chopping time, every subinterval which arises out of the ‘chopping’ has either an escape time, in which case the sequence above is empty or an essential return time in which case a unique pair of integers r_1 and m_1 are associated to it. Thus no two elements created up to this time can share the same sequence. Fixing one of these subintervals which has an essential return we consider higher iterates until the next time that it intersects Δ^+ . At this time it is further subdivided into subintervals. Those which have essential returns at this time all have another uniquely defined pair of integers r_2 and m_2 associated to them. However multiplicity can occur for those which have escape times: all the subintervals which fall in $\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta$ have an escape at this time, and therefore belong to $\mathcal{Q}^{(i)}$ and we do not consider further iterates, but all share the same first (and only) term of the associated sequence of return depths. However the number of such subintervals can be estimated by the number of elements of the partition $\mathcal{I}^+|_{\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta}$ plus at most two elements which can escape by falling outside Δ^+ . The number of such intervals is then $\leq 2(r_\delta - r_{\delta+})r_\delta^2 + 2 \leq r_\delta^3$. In the case of the intervals which have two or more returns we repeat the same reasoning to get the result. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 7.4. Sublemma 7.2.1 reduces the proof of Lemma 7.4 to a purely combinatorial calculation of the cardinality of the set $\mathcal{S}_R$ of all possible sequences of the form (74) satisfying the constraints given in (75). Let us denote by $\mathcal{S}_R(s)$ the subset of $\mathcal{S}_R$ given by sequences with some fixed number s of terms, and by $\mathcal{S}_R^+(s)$ the subsequence of these given by considering only positive r'_j s. Notice that the crucial condition $|r_j| \geq r_\delta$ implies that $s \leq R/r_\delta$, and therefore we have

$$(76) \quad \#\mathcal{S}_R \leq \sum_{s \leq R/r_\delta} \#\mathcal{S}_R(s) \leq \sum_{s \leq R/r_\delta} 2^s \#\mathcal{S}_R^+(s).$$

To obtain a bound for $\#\mathcal{S}_R^+(s)$ observe first of all that for a given sequence $(r_1, \dots, r_s)$ the terms $(m_1, \dots, m_s)$ contribute an additional factor of

$$(77) \quad \prod_{j=1}^s r_j^2 = e^{2 \sum_{j=1}^s \log r_j} = e^{2 \sum_{j=1}^s \frac{\log r_j}{r_j} r_j} \leq e^{2 \sum_{j=1}^s \frac{\log r_\delta}{r_\delta} r_j} = e^{\frac{2 \log r_\delta}{r_\delta} R}.$$

It remains therefore only to estimate the number of possible sequences $(r_1, \dots, r_s)$ with $r_j \geq r_\delta$ and $r_1 + \dots + r_s = R$. This number is bounded above by

$$\binom{R-1}{s} \leq \binom{R}{s} = \frac{R!}{(R-s)! s!}.$$

Indeed, consider a row of R objects. The number of ways of partitioning such a set into exactly s non-empty subsets is equivalent to the number of ways of selecting s objects out of the $R-1$ objects following the first object in the row. Indeed, once such s objects have been chosen we can define the partition as being formed by the consecutive objects which follow one of the choices (including the chosen object itself) until the object preceding the next chosen object.

Using Stirling's approximation formula for factorials $k! \in [1, 1 + \frac{1}{4k}] \sqrt{2\pi k} k^k e^{-k}$ we get

$$(78) \quad \binom{R}{s} = \frac{R!}{(R-s)! s!} \leq \frac{R^R}{(R-s)^{R-s} s^s} = \left(\frac{R}{R-s} \right)^R \left(\frac{R-s}{s} \right)^s.$$

To estimate the first term we use the fact that $s \leq R/r_\delta$ to get

$$(79) \quad \left(\frac{R}{R-s} \right)^R \leq \left(\frac{R}{R-\frac{R}{r_\delta}} \right)^R \leq \left(\frac{R}{R(1-\frac{1}{r_\delta})} \right)^R = \left(1 - \frac{1}{r_\delta} \right)^{-R} \leq e^{R \log(1+\frac{2}{r_\delta})} \leq e^{\frac{2}{r_\delta} R}.$$

Notice that the last two inequalities follow from the Taylor series $(1-x)^{-1} = 1 + x + x^2 + \dots \leq 1 + 2x$ with $x = 1/r_\delta$ and using the fact that $r_\delta \gg 2$, and from the fact that $\log(1+x) < x$ for all $x > 0$. To estimate the second term we write first of all

$$(80) \quad \left(\frac{R-s}{s} \right)^s \leq \left(\frac{R}{s} \right)^s \leq \left[\left(\frac{s}{R} \right)^{-\frac{s}{R}} \right]^R \leq \left[\left(\frac{1}{r_\delta} \right)^{-\frac{1}{r_\delta}} \right]^R = e^{\frac{\log r_\delta}{r_\delta} R}.$$

The third inequality uses the fact that x^{-x} is monotonically decreasing to 1 as $x \rightarrow 0$ and $s/R \leq 1/r_\delta$. Now, substituting (79) and (80) into (78) and multiplying by (77) gives

$$\#\mathcal{S}_R^+(s) \leq e^{\frac{2+3 \log r_\delta}{r_\delta} R}.$$

Substituting this into (76) we then get

$$\#\mathcal{S}_R \leq \sum_{s \leq R/r_\delta} 2^s e^{\frac{2+3 \log r_\delta}{r_\delta} R} = \sum_{s \leq R/r_\delta} e^{\frac{2+\log 2+3 \log r_\delta}{r_\delta} R} = \frac{R}{r_\delta} e^{\frac{2+\log 2+3 \log r_\delta}{r_\delta} R}.$$

Finally, taking into account the bound on the multiplicity of intervals with the same combinatorics, given by Sublemma 7.2.1, we get

$$(81) \quad \#\mathcal{Q}_n^{(i+1)}(\omega, R) \leq r_\delta^3 \#\mathcal{S}_R \leq R r_\delta^2 e^{\frac{2+\log 2+3 \log r_\delta}{r_\delta} R} = e^{\log R + 2 \log r_\delta} e^{\frac{2+\log 2+3 \log r_\delta}{r_\delta} R}.$$

We now use the fact that

$$\log R = \frac{\log R}{R} R \leq \frac{\log r_\delta}{r_\delta} R \quad \text{and} \quad \log r_\delta = \frac{\log r_\delta}{R} R \leq \frac{\log r_\delta}{r_\delta} R,$$

and thus, substituting into (81), we get

$$\#\mathcal{S}_R \leq e^{\frac{2+\log 2+5\log r_\delta}{r_\delta} R}.$$

By the definition of γ_0 in (8) we obtain the result. □

REFERENCES

- [1] José F. Alves, Stefano Luzzatto, and Vilton Pinheiro, *Lyapunov exponents and rates of mixing for one-dimensional maps.*, Ergodic Th. & Dyn. Syst. **24** (2004).
- [2] Alexander Arbieto and Carlos Matheus, *Decidability of Chaos for Some Families of Dynamical Systems*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics **4** (2004), 269–275.
- [3] Artur Avila and Carlos Gustavo Moreira, *Bifurcations of unimodal maps*, Dynamical Systems. Part II, Pubbl. Cent. Ric. Mat. Ennio Giorgi, Scuola Norm. Sup., Pisa, 2003, pp. 1–22.
- [4] Artur Avila and Carlos Gustavo Moreira, *Statistical properties of unimodal maps: smooth families with negative Schwarzian derivative*, Astérisque (2003), xviii, 81–118, Geometric methods in dynamics. I. (English, with English and French summaries)
- [5] Artur Avila, Mikhail Lyubich, and Wellington de Melo, *Regular or stochastic dynamics in real analytic families of unimodal maps*, Invent. Math. **154** (2003), 451–550.
- [6] Michael Benedicks and Lennart Carleson, *On iterations of $1 - ax^2$ on $(-1, 1)$* , Ann. of Math. **122** (1985), 1–25.
- [7] ———, *The dynamics of the Hénon map*, Ann. of Math. **133** (1991), 73–169.
- [8] Henk Bruin, Stefano Luzzatto, and Sebastian van Strien, *Decay of correlations in one-dimensional dynamics*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Sup. **36** (2003), 621–646.
- [9] Henk Bruin, Weixiao Shen, and Sebastian van Strien, *Invariant measures exist without a growth condition*, Comm. Math. Phys. **241** (2003), 287–306.
- [10] P. Collet and J.-P. Eckmann, *Positive Lyapunov exponents and absolute continuity for maps of the interval*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **3** (1983), 13–46.
- [11] P. Collet, J.-P. Eckmann, and O. E. Lanford III, *Universal properties of maps on an interval*, Comm. Math. Phys. **76** (1980), 211–254.
- [12] Jacek Graczyk and Grzegorz Świątek, *Generic hyperbolicity in the logistic family*, Ann. of Math. (2) **146** (1997), 1–52.
- [13] M. V. Jakobson, *Piecewise smooth maps with absolutely continuous invariant measures and uniformly scaled Markov partitions*, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics **69** (2001), 825–881.
- [14] ———, *Parameter choice for families of maps with many critical points* (2004).
- [15] ———, *Topological and metric properties of one-dimensional endomorphisms*, Sov. Math. Dokl. **19** (1978), 1452–1456.
- [16] ———, *Absolutely continuous invariant measures for one-parameter families of one-dimensional maps*, Comm. Math. Phys. **81** (1981), 39–88.
- [17] Gerhard Keller, *Exponents, attractors and Hopf decompositions for interval maps*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **10** (1990), 717–744.
- [18] Gerhard Keller and Tomasz Nowicki, *Spectral theory, zeta functions and the distribution of periodic points for Collet-Eckmann maps*, Comm. Math. Phys. **149** (1992), 31–69.
- [19] Oleg Kozlovski, *Axiom A maps are dense in the space of unimodal maps in the C^k topology*, Ann. of Math. (2) **157** (2003), 1–43.
- [20] Oleg Kozlovski, Weixiao Shen, and Sebastian van Strien, *Density of hyperbolicity in dimension one* (2004), <http://www.maths.warwick.ac.uk/~strien/Publications/rigid4june.ps> (Preprint).
- [21] Oscar E. Lanford III, *A computer-assisted proof of the Feigenbaum conjectures*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **6** (1982), 427–434.

- [22] Stefano Luzzatto, *Stochastic behaviour in non-uniformly expanding maps*, Handbook of Dynamical Systems (2005).
- [23] Stefano Luzzatto and Tucker, Warwick, *Non-uniformly expanding dynamics in maps with singularities and criticalities*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1999), 179–226.
- [24] Stefano Luzzatto and Viana, Marcelo, *Positive Lyapunov exponents for Lorenz-like families with criticalities*, Astérisque (2000), xiii, 201–237, Géométrie complexe et systèmes dynamiques (Orsay, 1995). (English, with English and French summaries)
- [25] Tomasz Kaczynski, Konstantin Mischaikow, and Marian Mrozek, *Computational homology*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 157, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.
- [26] Konstantin Mischaikow, *Topological techniques for efficient rigorous computation in dynamics*, Acta Numer. **11** (2002), 435–477.
- [27] Piotr Zgliczyński and Konstantin Mischaikow, *Rigorous numerics for partial differential equations: the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation*, Found. Comput. Math. **1** (2001), 255–288.
- [28] Rafael de la Llave, *A tutorial on KAM theory* (2004) (Preprint).
- [29] E. D. Lorenz, *Deterministic nonperiodic flow*, J. Atmosph. Sci. **20** (1963), 130–141.
- [30] Mikhail Lyubich, *Almost every real quadratic map is either regular or stochastic*, Ann. of Math. (2) **156** (2002), 1–78.
- [31] ———, *Dynamics of quadratic polynomials. I, II*, Acta Math. **178** (1997), 185–247, 247–297.
- [32] Ricardo Mañé, *Hyperbolicity, sinks and measure in one-dimensional dynamics*, Comm. Math. Phys. **100** (1985), 495–524.
- [33] Wellington de Melo and Sebastian van Strien, *One-dimensional dynamics*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], vol. 25, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
- [34] Michal Misiurewicz, *Absolutely continuous measures for certain maps of an interval*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1981), 17–51.
- [35] Tomasz Nowicki and Sebastian van Strien, *Invariant measures exist under a summability condition for unimodal maps*, Invent. Math. **105** (1991), 123–136.
- [36] Marek Ryszard Rychlik, *Another proof of Jakobson’s theorem and related results*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **8** (1988), 93–109.
- [37] C. Simó and J. C. Tatjer, *Windows of attraction of the logistic map*, European Conference on Iteration Theory (Batschuns, 1989), World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 1991, pp. 335–342.
- [38] ———, *personal communication* (2005).
- [39] Ph. Thieullen, C. Tresser, and L.-S. Young, *Positive Lyapunov exponent for generic one-parameter families of unimodal maps*, J. Anal. Math. **64** (1994), 121–172.
- [40] Hans Thunberg, *Positive exponent in families with flat critical point*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **19** (1999), 767–807.
- [41] Masato Tsujii, *Positive Lyapunov exponents in families of one-dimensional dynamical systems*, Invent. Math. **111** (1993), 113–137.
- [42] Warwick Tucker, *A rigorous ODE solver and Smale’s 14th problem*, Found. Comput. Math. **2** (2002), 53–117.
- [43] ———, *The Lorenz attractor exists*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **328** (1999), 1197–1202. (English, with English and French summaries)
- [44] S. Ulam and J. von Neumann, *On combination of stochastic and deterministic processes*, Bull. AMS **53** (1947), 1120.
- [45] Jean-Christophe Yoccoz, *Jakobson’s Theorem* (2001) (Manuscript).
- [46] L.-S. Young, *Decay of correlations for certain quadratic maps*, Comm. Math. Phys. **146** (1992), 123–138.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE, LONDON, UK

E-mail address: stefano.luzzatto@imperial.ac.uk

URL: <http://www.ma.ic.ac.uk/~luzzatto>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO, JAPAN

E-mail address: takahasi@kum.kyoto-u.ac.jp